

# MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

---

June, 1950

---

DEREK VAN ABBÉ. <i>The Middle High German Written Language—Fact or Fancy?</i> .....	131
JOHN LANCASTER RIORDAN. <i>More Notes to Marner's "Minnelieder"</i> .....	146
B. F. BART. <i>Aspects of the Comic in Pulci and Rabelais</i> ...	156
MANUEL OLGUIN. <i>Valera's Philosophical Arguments Against Naturalism</i> .....	164
FRANK W. LINDSAY. <i>Néron and Narcisse: A Duality Resolved</i> .....	169
PAUL A. JORGENSEN. <i>The Courtship Scene in "Henry V"</i> .....	180
ROBERT C. ELLIOTT. <i>The Early 'Scots Magazine'</i> .....	189
SELMA JEANNE COHEN. <i>Hopkins' "As Kingfishers Catch Fire"</i> .....	197
THOMAS H. McNEAL. <i>Poe's 'Zenobia': An Early Satire on Margaret Fuller</i> .....	205
JOHN J. PARRY. <i>A Bibliography of Critical Arthurian Literature for the Year 1949</i> .....	217
REVIEWS .....	237
BOOKS RECEIVED .....	253

---

Volume Eleven

Number Two

---

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON PRESS  
SEATTLE

# MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

Edited by

EDWARD GODFREY COX  
*Managing Editor*

DUDLEY D. GRIFFITH

CURTIS C. D. VAIL

GEORGE W. UMPHREY

*Direct Contributions and Business Correspondence to*  
Managing Editor, Modern Language Quarterly  
Parrington Hall  
University of Washington  
Seattle 5

Subscription price \$2.00 per year • Single copies \$0.75  
Issued in March, June, September, December

Entered as second-class matter May 6, 1940, at the post office at Seattle, Washington,  
under the Act of March 3, 1879

PRINTED IN U. S. A.



M

Vol

De

Joh

B.

M

F

P

R

S

T

J



# MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

Volume Eleven

June, 1950

Number Two

## ARTICLES

- Derek Van Abbé. The Middle High German Written Language  
—Fact or Fancy? . . . . . 131
- John Lancaster Riordan. More Notes to Marner's  
"Minnelieder" . . . . . 146
- B. F. Bart. Aspects of the Comic in Pulci and Rabelais . . . 156
- Manuel Olguín. Valera's Philosophical Arguments Against  
Naturalism . . . . . 164
- Frank W. Lindsay. Néron and Narcisse: A Duality Resolved . 169
- Paul A. Jorgensen. The Courtship Scene in *Henry V* . . . 180
- Robert C. Elliott. The Early *Scots Magazine* . . . . . 189
- Selma Jeanne Cohen. Hopkins' "As Kingfishers Catch Fire" . 197
- Thomas H. McNeal. Poe's *Zenobia*: An Early Satire on  
Margaret Fuller . . . . . 205
- John J. Parry. A Bibliography of Critical Arthurian Literature  
for the Year 1949 . . . . . 217

## REVIEWS

- William Anthony Willibrand. Ernst Toller and His Ideology  
[*Mimi I. Jehle*] . . . . . 237
- S. Etta Schreiber. The German Woman in the Age of  
Enlightenment [*F. Andrew Brown*] . . . . . 237
- Bruno Boesch. Aus frühmittelhochdeutscher Dichtung: Ein  
Lesebuch  
Friedrich Ranke. Das Nibelungenlied [*Lester W. J. Seifert*] . 239

Harvey W. Hewett-Thayer. Hoffman: Author of the Tales [ <i>Franz René Sommerfeld</i> ]	240
Frances A. Yates. The French Academies of the Sixteenth Century [ <i>A. C. Keller</i> ]	242
Renée Lang. André Gide et La Pensée Allemande [ <i>Georgette R. Schuler</i> ]	243
E. Allison Peers. A Critical Anthology of Spanish Verse [ <i>George W. Umphrey</i> ]	245
R. M. Lumiansky. The Canterbury Tales of Geoffrey Chaucer [ <i>Haldeen Braddy</i> ]	246
Donald Lemen Clark. John Milton at St. Paul's School [ <i>William Haller</i> ]	248
William L. Payne. Index to Defoe's <i>Review</i> [ <i>Oscar Sherwin</i> ]	249
S. Foster Damon. William Blake: His Philosophy and Symbols [ <i>Edward E. Bostetter</i> ]	249
William M. Gibson and George Arms. A Bibliography of William Dean Howells [ <i>Rudolf Kirk</i> ]	251
Books Received	253

## THE MIDDLE HIGH GERMAN WRITTEN LANGUAGE FACT OR FANCY?

By DEREK VAN ABBÉ

The basis of all philological research is the *dialect*, the language of daily life (German "Mundart"—the fashion of the mouth—renders it exactly). A combination of elements of different dialects, which becomes used over more than a local area, is a *common language* ("Gemeinsprache"—it may be called, even more exactly, in relation to its wider use, "Umgangssprache"). When this common language is written down (using stereotyped and, above all, inevitably aging orthographical symbols), it becomes a *written language* ("Schriftsprache"). Over and above this, there is finally the *literary language*, the purified language, which is a compound made by writers out of dialect and common language to express the *Zeitgeist* in terms of what is called "Literature."<sup>1</sup>

In M.H.G. times there were certainly popular dialects, there was also probably a common language (at least at the courts or the Imperial Court). There were, however, a written language and a literary language only in a special sense which is to be discussed here. The existence and the interrelation of these last two is in fact a most involved problem to which there is no easy solution.

When in 1820 Karl Lachmann stated that "two writers of the 15th century employed a fully-fashioned High German, with only minor dialectal variations, where uncultured scribes inserted other forms of the vulgar tongue, some older, some corrupt,"<sup>2</sup> he could hardly have foreseen the headaches he was to cause. For the question cannot be answered in these terms and should never, in fact, have been formulated thus. However, consideration of the problem nowadays involves factors which Lachmann can hardly be expected to have known.

There are modern scholars who claim that Lachmann meant only that M.H.G. possessed a uniform spelling. But even that is not a straightforward question—only the most modern research into the history and phonology of the German dialects could at all accurately describe how M.H.G. dialects were in fact spoken or written. F. Kaufmann wrote in 1888: "It would be most important to have proved if (and how far) we can trust the spelling when it comes to reproducing phonetic values. It is *a priori* unlikely that there was any orthographical custom. . . . The most reliable guide, to my mind, is the study of the phonetic history of each particular dialect."<sup>3</sup> The pioneer

<sup>1</sup> A good discussion in F. Maurer, "Geschichte der deutschen Sprache," *Germanische Philologie, Behagel-Festschrift* (Heidelberg, 1934).

<sup>2</sup> *Auswahl aus den hochdeutschen Dichtern d. 13 Jhs.* (Berlin, 1820), p. viii.

<sup>3</sup> Behagel, "Argumente für eine mhd. Schriftsprache," *Paul und Braunes Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, 13 (1888), 464 n. Hereafter cited PBB.

Germanists' almost complete unfamiliarity with dialect was a most confusing factor, as was also their poor knowledge of history. Lachmann inclined, for example, to deduce a uniform M.H.G. written language from the unifying efforts of the Staufens emperors; to which as early as 1867 F. Pfeiffer retorted that the political troubles of the Staufens epoch could hardly be called unifying, while the Staufens themselves (living, as they did, mainly in Italy) were much less important as patrons of literature than were the Austrian and Thuringian rulers.<sup>4</sup>

Dialectal weakness confused much of the early work on M.H.G. texts: for example, J. Grimm<sup>5</sup> and Lachmann were led away by Alemanic versions of M.H.G. works (which were the versions most widely known in their day) to make Alemanic the basis of the M.H.G. written language: later when Middle German was discovered, W. Braune (for one) took that as the basis.<sup>6</sup> New non-Alemanic versions were also discovered, many of which were written in an apparently very localized dialect. Having investigated Cologne official documents and the traditions of the Cologne Chancellery, Braune then hazarded that all the German dialects of that time were very close to one another and could in consequence be written down with considerable uniformity (uniformity at least with the dialect). He and Paul<sup>7</sup> consequently denied the necessity for a special literary language, and these early researches into dialects certainly seemed to prove their case. Braune considered that the confusion had been caused by taking Middle German texts with their shifted *tenues* (like High German) as texts artificially High-Germanized by some kind of court language. But his conclusion<sup>8</sup> proved to be equally unjustified, viz., that these M.G. texts (whose sounds are not particularly High-Germanized) show absolutely no signs of a literary language—he overlooked those traces of a literary language which soon afterward were brought into the argument. These new researches placed the whole problem on a new plane.

It is known today that, if ever there was a uniform M.H.G. spelling, such uniformity covered only restricted dialectal territories. It is no longer considered that any single dialect alone formed the basis of the so-called M.H.G. written language. Nowadays the question is asked, as by Singer: "If there was a M.H.G. written language at all, what

<sup>4</sup> H. Paul, *Gab es eine mhd. Schriftsprache?* (Halle, 1873), p. 3. This was Paul's *Habilitationsschrift*, and he admitted doubts on the results of his research at this point in *Deutsche Grammatik*, I (Halle, 1916), 116. Cf. also Pfeiffer, "Über Wesen und Bildung der höfischen Sprache in mhd. Zeit," *Freie Forschung* (1867), pp. 329-30.

<sup>5</sup> Preface to 2nd edition of *Deutsche Grammatik*, I (Berlin, 1870), xii.

<sup>6</sup> An excellent summary of the history of the controversy is contained in: W. Henzen, *Schriftsprache und Mundart* (Zürich, 1938), pp. 48-51.

<sup>7</sup> Paul, *op. cit.*, p. 3 and *Grammatik*, I, 116.

<sup>8</sup> "Zur Kenntnis des Fränkischen," *PBB*, 1 (1874), 33.

motives might cause a M.H.G. writer to discard his native dialect?"<sup>9</sup> And we follow Singer in distinguishing four motives. The first important fact is the written language proper, i.e., contemporary spelling as historically developed to reproduce phonetically or merely traditionally the various sounds, especially according to the traditions of the widely separated chancelleries. Second, we study the influence of the speech of the "upper" classes (who obviously had most influence on the M.H.G. writer) on the written forms of literature. Third, the literary language of the works—compared also with other written documents, especially all those whose place of origin is firmly fixed—must be studied to see if and to what extent they are generally appreciated.<sup>10</sup> Fourth, we study the literary technique of the M.H.G. writers, especially those whose language is an important clue.

The last two subjects were broached almost simultaneously by Carl von Kraus (Heinrich von Veldeke)<sup>11</sup> and Konrad Zwierzina (Hartmann and Wolfram).<sup>12</sup> They discovered that these writers—clearly aiming at a faithful reproduction of their works in parts where different dialects were spoken—kept their rhymes as general as possible, i.e., used words which were spoken in the same way in the various M.H.G. dialects. Fantastic as this "hair-splitting pedantry" (Ehrismann)<sup>13</sup> may appear to some, it was very necessary at a time when reproduction depended so much on the scribe. Veldeke came from Limburg but wrote ultimately for the Thuringian court—the Low German, aiming at a High German audience, had therefore to write in such a way as to avoid unhappy "improvement" by zealous High German scribes. (Albrecht von Scharfenberg was to complain, at a later period, that a "shriber dicke reht unrihte machet."<sup>14</sup>) The only way to do this was for the writer to ensure that his vocabulary—and above all his rhymes—would not appear strange to a scribe using a different dialect from his own. Such harmony is naturally difficult to achieve—the Upper German dialects approximate more closely to one another than to the Low German; hence the greater success in this sphere of Wolfram and Hartmann (their task being easier), but Veldeke still succeeded to a considerable extent by using forms which were as neutral as possible, i.e., words and especially vowels which, for all their difference in pronunciation, could at least be written with the same letters in Upper as in Lower Germany.<sup>15</sup>

It may be objected that Veldeke texts showing these characteristics only prove clever High-Germanization by a good scribe. Kraus shows,

<sup>9</sup> "Die mhd. Schriftsprache," in *Aufsätze und Vorträge* (Tübingen, 1912), p. 123.

<sup>10</sup> Paul, *Gab es . . .*, p. 36.

<sup>11</sup> *H. v. V. und die mhd. Dichtung* (Halle, 1899).

<sup>12</sup> "Beobachtungen zum Reimgebrauch Hartmanns und Wolframs," in *Heinzel-Festschrift* (Halle, 1898).

<sup>13</sup> *Anzeiger für deutsches Allertum*, 26 (1900), 41. Hereafter cited as *Afd.A.*

<sup>14</sup> Singer, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

<sup>15</sup> Kraus, *op. cit.*, p. xi.

however,<sup>16</sup> that, had this been the case, the improver would not only have removed Veldeke's provincialisms but would have woven H.G. expressions into the text—instead of the Netherlands *san*, perhaps Middle German *sa*; instead of Neth. *wale*, H.G. *wol* or *wole*; instead of Neth. ending *-inge*, H.G. *-unge*—"improvements" which are completely absent from the texts. The Veldeke MSS avoided all unusual expressions precisely because they were dialectal—and the most competent person to do this was clearly the writer, for only a Netherlander writing for foreigners would have consciously tried to avoid all dialectal forms. Evidence of conscious effort is also shown by instances like the employment of stereotyped groups which are forgotten for a while and then, much later, remembered and again used in groups.<sup>17</sup> There is a marked growth of carelessness towards the end of *Eneit*, the author finishing the MS (which had been stolen from him) when he was past the peak of his linguistic skill and using a number of Netherlands idioms.<sup>18</sup>

Veldeke never rhymed *d* with *t*, or *e* with *i*, although in many cases his dialect allowed him to pronounce them in the same way—*fit* (Zeit): *wit* (weiß); *striden* (streiten): *liden* (leiden). He avoided a large number of very common Neth. words which would have been useful rhymes, e.g., *pfärt*, *noemen* (nennen), *vort* (fortan), *quaet* (böse), *claer* (lüter), *vaer* (Furcht), *hoe* (wie), and *vroet* (klug): (*quaet* was very popular indeed—*Reineke Vos* uses it 16 times as a rhyme, *Servatius*—although it appears 15 times inside the line—only twice as a rhyme, while *Eneit* does not show it at all).<sup>19</sup> He avoided many typically Neth. endings, e.g., *-inge* as well as the particle *sân*. Moreover, although French words were emigrating to Germany in masses via Holland, he used far fewer French loanwords than did his successors, probably because in his day they were still too obviously a definite mark of Neth. origin: Hartmann praised him specifically for this abstinence—he mentioned particularly his avoidance of *blâme* (Tadel), *fel* (grausam), and *sot* which would have been native to him and which later became an integral part of the Upper German knightly vocabulary.<sup>20</sup>

This careful choosing of words was necessary if Veldeke's Neth. rhymes were not to tempt the scribes to unpoetic paraphrasing; hence the wholly Neth. forms appear only within the line—and even these become rare as Veldeke's technique improves. He completely discards eventually even such necessary stylistic turns as *af*, *blide*, *van desen*, *dogen*, *doen* with the infinitive (for "cause"), because they were incomprehensible in Middle and Upper German and hence could be wrongly translated. (Kraus counted their incidence: *blide*, for ex-

<sup>16</sup> Kraus, *op. cit.*, pp. viii-ix and 147.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 149-50.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 155.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 158.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 187.

ample, appears three times in the songs, where Veldeke was completely unconstrained, but disappears entirely in the fourteen times longer *Servatius* and in the thirty times longer *Eneit*: *doen* with the infinitive never comes into the rhyme, appears quite often in *Servatius* within the line, but is completely absent from *Eneit*.<sup>21</sup>) And, conversely, making the chance acquaintance of a few U.G. forms, he immediately used them, e.g., *iuw*, *ouw*, which occur only in *Eneit* and are fairly late.

Hartmann<sup>22</sup> and Wolfram used the same method as Veldeke: Hartmann (like Gottfried later) praised Veldeke above all for the comparative purity of his language and the later Court epic poets clearly learned their technique from him. Hartmann's ability to get round dialectal forms is well known because of the polemic about his birthplace: there is hardly any real internal evidence for the arguments as to his Swabian or Alemanic origin: for example, he uses both *seit* and *saget*, but both are, so to speak, neutral forms and common to a number of widely separated regions.<sup>23</sup> Usually, however, he even avoids such doubtful doublets, as also *began* and *begunde*, *wande* and *wante*, *gesetzet* and *gesat*.<sup>24</sup> He never uses Alem. *vie* and *hie* but always U.G. *vienc* and *hienc* and avoids all Alem. forms of "as though": *sam*, *same*, *alsam*, *alsame*, precisely because of this uncertainty as to pronunciation and employment.

Hartmann's development as a stylist can be followed step for step in his five epics.<sup>25</sup> Without harming his vocabulary, he discarded almost everything that could in any way be misunderstood and even made corrections later when he heard that a word of his was not spoken in all places with the same accent. In *Iwein*, for example, the word *kam* disappears after line 1000 because the poet learned that it was also pronounced *kom*: he sacrificed *hâte* and *hête* as soon as he heard that they were pronounced like *hêt*, e.g., in Alsace. He left out all doublets such as *gekleit* and *gekleidet*. *Heinrich* never appears in the rhyme, apparently because the various dialects varied in its pronunciation between *Heinrich* and *Heinriche*.

Wolfram can be followed through *Parzival* and *Willehalm* as he attempts to become generally understandable all over Germany, without being "improved" by the scribes.<sup>26</sup> Wolfram accentuated an already mentioned Hartmann mannerism and avoided in addition *kleite*, *leite*, and *bereite* because of the fluctuating pronunciation of

<sup>21</sup> Kraus, *op. cit.*, pp. 9-11. For Veldeke, see also A. Götze, "Die mhd. Schriftsprache," *Z. f. Deutschkunde* (1929), p. 18.

<sup>22</sup> G. Ehrismann, "Rezension v. Zwierzinas Beobachtungen," *AfdA*, 26 (1900), 41-48.

<sup>23</sup> A good discussion of this in H. Rückert, *Geschichte der mhd. Schriftsprache* (Leipzig, 1845), p. 124.

<sup>24</sup> Zwierzina, "Mhd. Studien," *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, 44 (1900) and 45 (1901). Hereafter cited as *ZfdA*.

<sup>25</sup> Götze, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 24.



these words, passed over *az* (aß), which could be pronounced *ās*, and removed the doubtful preterite forms of *hân*: *hate* and *hēten*. It is noteworthy that all the Alemanic writers avoided as far as they could the use of their dialectal *weder* (for *wider*) and the weak subjunctive *hangeti* for *hinge*;<sup>27</sup> the Bavarians avoided their subjunctive in *-oet*, e.g., *chundoet*, as well as their genitive with *wider* and *gegen*; the Middle Germans avoided their subjunctive *brente*, *nente*, *sente* (substituting *mohte*, *solte*, *wolde*, or *wurde brennen*).<sup>28</sup> The Bavarian Wirnt von Grafenberg (author of *Wigalois*) surpassed even Hartmann and Wolfram; he passed over *het*, *hete*, *tet*, and *tete*!<sup>29</sup> Ulrich von Türlin never rhymed *Heinrich* with *rich* or *ich*, but only with other uncertain forms, e.g., adjectives in *-lich*.<sup>30</sup>

It was this peculiarity which first drew Behaghel's attention to the problem of the M.H.G. written language—he noticed that all the Alemanic poets had *e*-endings in the weak tone, where the contemporary Alemanic dialect most probably had these only following O.H.G. short vowels<sup>31</sup>—the long vowels remained unchanged (even today, e.g., in Valais). They wrote *dienen*, *gasse*, *sunnen*, *güete* throughout for *dienon*, *gassa*, *sunnun*, *güeti* which Behaghel found in general use in the official documents of the time: they rhymed *dannen* (<*dannon*): *mannen*, *hinnen* (<*hinnan*): *beginnen*, and *bezwarn* (<*bezwaron*): *varn*.<sup>32</sup> Behaghel took this to be a sufficient proof of the existence of a M.H.G. literary written language. His conclusions have been attacked from the standpoint of historico-phonetic orthography since it is not entirely certain that the MSS are to be trusted to give a faithful picture of contemporary dialect. E. Damköhler, a L.G. philologist, found<sup>33</sup> in Middle L.G. MSS from the Halberstadt area a large number of M.G. words and a majority of words from other L.G. dialectal areas—Bachmann on the other hand found a considerable difference between the original language of Zürich MSS and that of even the next large town, e.g., Schaffhausen.<sup>34</sup> The verdict can only be open; the only certainty is the existence of a M.H.G. used in chancelleries exerting reciprocal influences on one another.

Behaghel's examples can be paralleled in Bavarian and L.G.<sup>35</sup> Bavarian writers nowhere mark the general mutation of *ei* to *oa* (e.g.,

<sup>27</sup> Götze, *op. cit.*, pp. 17-18.

<sup>28</sup> P. Pietsch, *M. Luther und die hd. Schriftsprache* (Breslau, 1883), pp. 6-7.

<sup>29</sup> Götze, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 26-27.

<sup>31</sup> *Zur Frage nach einer mhd. Schriftsprache* (Basel, 1886), pp. 48-60. Also Paul, *Grammatik*, p. 119.

<sup>32</sup> H. Naumann, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatursprachen* (Leipzig, 1926), p. 15; and Behaghel, *Zur Frage* . . . , p. 49.

<sup>33</sup> "Mundart der Urkunden des Klosters Ilsenburg und der Stadt Halberstadt," *Germania*, 35 (1890), 131-66.

<sup>34</sup> In Behaghel's "Der Stand d. germ. b. im Anlaut d. Bairischen u. d. mhd. Schriftsprache," *PBB*, 57 (1933), 278.

<sup>35</sup> F. Wrede, "Rezension v. H. Fischers: Zur Geschichte des Mhd.," *AfdA*, 16 (1890), 287.



in *Stein*) or the diphthongization of *i*, *û*, and *iu*:<sup>36</sup> the well-known Bav. dual *ez*, *enk*, *enker* appears in none of the writings before 1400, although the word itself was most probably, as an old Germanic left-over, at all times current in Bavaria.<sup>37</sup> In the L.G. field O. Höfler<sup>38</sup> noted in some courtly words H.G. *-ft* instead of L.G. *-cht*, e.g., *druftin*, *hoftit*, and these have likewise been interpreted as a striving towards a courtly language. In favor of their being a purely cultural importation into L.G. is the fact that unshifted consonants in L.G. show none of those signs which would make the change in other consonants comprehensible to us from the standpoint of the sound laws: words like *Kerze*, *Zettel*, *sart*, and *strafen* can only be borrowings from H.G. They could not have developed into these forms from L.G.<sup>39</sup>

Summarizing these two proofs, it may be said that both show at the least that M.H.G. writers used a language showing considerable differentiation from dialect and firmly avoided to an ever-increasing degree typical dialect forms in their vocabulary. Pfeiffer deduced that disappearance from German of the sounding rhyme-vowels from the Crusades; the full endings of O.H.G. proved impracticable in intensive intercourse with the foreigners who swarmed up the Rhine after the Crusades.<sup>40</sup> He drew attention to the fact that it was in the first half of the twelfth century that the sounding and the dull rhyme were for the first time clearly differentiated and that in the 1180's Veldeke introduced the precise rhyme: the old full endings would at a pinch have continued to do here; but in countless instances they could not have been employed for the precise and the sounding rhyme "without shackling poetry in the most unbearable fashion."<sup>41</sup> That this was accepted by the scribe before the weaker endings were pronounced is readily explicable by reference to the monopolistic position of the scribe and the drive for simplification and "accommodation in writing" (as Paul called it)<sup>42</sup> which always appears in writing spoken languages—letters are easier to change than sounds!

More uniform rhymes and new *e*-endings, as well as the greater grammatical uniformity, may however be only negative signs; they show the M.H.G. writers merely avoiding something without necessarily offering a more positive substitute. And this is precisely the picture we do have of M.H.G. culture. The courtly culture is a restricted minority culture, built up on *zûht* and *mâze*, i.e., in life and living also undesirable extremes were excluded. It is evident, as H. Naumann has observed,<sup>43</sup> that the *Formwille* of the courtly civiliza-

<sup>36</sup> Singer, *op. cit.*, pp. 126-27.

<sup>37</sup> Paul, *Grammatik*, p. 119.

<sup>38</sup> "Altnordisch TYPTA," *PBB*, 52 (1928), 45.

<sup>39</sup> R. Heinzel, *Geschichte d. ndfränkischen Geschäftssprache* (Paderborn, 1874), p. 178; and Götze, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

<sup>40</sup> "Über Wesen u. Bildung d. höfischen Sprache in mhd. Zeit," *Freie Forschung* (1867), pp. 319 and 323-24.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 324.

<sup>42</sup> *Gab es . . .*, pp. 16 and 23.

<sup>43</sup> *Geschichte*, p. 17.

tion would tend to normalize orthography and the art of the scribe.

The absence of positive achievement springs from the same source. The unity of the French language is well known to have been a function of the early centralization of the French provinces: thus Garnier de Ponte-Sainte-Maxence boasts that: "Mes langages est buen, car en France [i.e., the Ile-de-France] fui nez," and the provincials boasted of writing like men "au bourg à Saint-Denis."<sup>44</sup> But such centralization was never achieved in Germany in M.H.G. times, and at the time when the dialects were still close enough together to have facilitated centralization of the language, there were (and remained) three or four main areas of cultural life: the Alemanic Staufers, the Franconian Thuringians, and the Bavarian-Austrian Viennese all maintained their own superiority while local patronage encouraged the arts in Switzerland, along the lower Rhine (Cleves and Cologne), and in Lower Saxony. Paul sums up: "Centralisation could not be achieved as long as a centre was absent."<sup>45</sup> Paul continues that, had there been a M.H.G. common language, it would not have yielded ground so easily to N.H.G.: a century before Luther and the normalizing tendencies of the printer, written German shows a variety which is a poor indication of the possibilities of unifying a language dependent on local and comparatively isolated offices.

The same argument might be applied to the question of the court language which is alleged to have influenced the poets. At the outset a caution is necessary: it is probable that the writers did in fact understand and use the language of the courts—but this does not mean either that it was their mother tongue or that the written language reproduced all the current modes of speech or that it could reproduce them if they formed too glaring a contradiction to the accepted literary language. It is highly probable that, if there was a separate knightly class, the latter spoke differently from the people; Naumann<sup>46</sup> uses the psychological argument here that it is indeed necessary and always follows from a restricted minority culture with a restricted upper class. Höfler also posits a court language simply by reason of the isolated position of the knightly class: he tends to regard it to a certain extent as a new dialect which frequently seems reactionary in comparison with the rapidly changing dialect in some dialectal areas. This court language is therefore the particular road trodden by a particular stratum of society for its own ends—every social stratum has a kind of natural inclination to develop its own dialect.<sup>47</sup> Jelinek pointed out that even in his day the Bavarian peasantry called the speech of the towns the *Herrensprache*, although the difference had long since disappeared: Singer found that in the

<sup>44</sup> Kraus, *op. cit.*, p. 176.

<sup>45</sup> *Gab es . . .*, p. 9.

<sup>46</sup> "Versuch einer Geschichte d. deutschen Sprache als Geschichte d. deutschen Geistes," *Dt. Vjs.*, 1 (1923), 139-42.

<sup>47</sup> See also Paul, *Gab es . . .*, pp. 32-33.

Cologne area there were four different ways of pronouncing *i* with certain consonants, graded strictly according to social standing, viz., *mīl*, *met*, *möt*, *mot*.<sup>48</sup>

Such tendencies, if indeed they existed in M.H.G. times, could in fact have formed a unifying factor, especially if the nobility—the only social stratum to engage in lively social intercourse (the clergy spoke almost exclusively Latin)<sup>49</sup>—watered down its dialectal extremes as do, for example, the upper classes of a still dialect-speaking area like Switzerland.<sup>50</sup> Singer considers Swiss dialectal conditions sufficiently analogous with M.H.G. to base the existence of a knightly common language on them, thus: the difference between the speech of a knight and that of his villein would be something like the difference between the speech of the Zürich *Oberländer* and that of the Zürich businessman in constant touch with the other cantons.

The influence of this common language, if such it can be called, on the writer cannot be measured exactly. One must stress its hypothetical character; indeed its influence clearly varied from area to area. Thus the written language (and probably the *Herrensprache* as well) did not follow the Bavarian vowel mutations. But it appears that in the Alemanic area the written language with its weakened *e*-endings was in advance of the dialect, which only half-accepted the weakening. I am equally loath to accept other arguments, such as the story of the so-called “uncourtly” words. Of course there were certain “uncourtly” words—probably many which would be reckoned such today—but the archaic vocabulary of the *Spielmannsepen* (*recke*, *degen*, *wigant*, *maere*, *vrech*, *verschröten*) was also avoided in the written language, probably because it offended *din mase*, which was attempting to bring the M.H.G. literary language back to natural speech (the speech, of course, of a certain “cultivated” stratum).<sup>51</sup> Similar tendencies may be seen in the striking avoidance of clichés such as *der herre min*, *ein ritter quot* and the striving for a more natural word order by interruptions of the rhyme and change of rhythm; a striving for a more polished but also more “natural” style.<sup>52</sup>

Naturally the *Herrensprache* distinguished itself by its use of the jargon of Chivalry (and later of the *Minnedienst* as well)—the words show how much social standing influenced vocabulary: its development is evidenced by the L.G. sound forms—originating with the French knights, the *Herrensprache* passed through the Chivalry of the flourishing Netherlands and then flowed up the Rhine along with the growing volume of European trade and travel. It consists almost

<sup>48</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 126.

<sup>49</sup> Braune, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

<sup>50</sup> Henzen, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

<sup>51</sup> Paul, *Gab es . . .*, pp. 32-33; and Naumann, *Geschichte*, p. 19.

<sup>52</sup> F. Pfeiffer, “Über d. Parzival und Wolframs Sprachgebrauch,” *AfdA* (1912), *passim*; Henzen, *op. cit.*, pp. 54-57; and Höfler, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

entirely of ceremonial or knightly words: *ritter*, *dörpaere*, *wâpen* (alongside H.G. *wâfen*), *hövesch*, *baneken* (sich herumtummeln)—as well as auxiliaries of Low Franconian origin, *ors* (instead of U.G. *ros*) and *born* (for H.G. *brennen* or *brunne*), and fashionable diminutives in *-kin* beside the much more widespread and usual *-lin*: *pardrîsekin*, *schapelekin*, *blüemikîn*.<sup>53</sup> There were loud complaints against the fashion and the affected preference for this *vlaemen* (the exaggerations are also well in evidence in many French "noble" loanwords—again, and especially here, in Low Franconian versions: *fier*, *kurtois*, *kondvieren*, *kompanie*, *merci*). These would seem to prove the formation of a "special" language corresponding to the "special" culture of the feudal nobility.

But I must insist that all this does not definitely prove that this was the writers' *Schriftsprache*. The pre-condition for a literary *Schriftsprache* is the existence of a customary tradition of orthography.<sup>54</sup> This had probably existed to a greater or lesser degree since Notker: there is no other means of explaining the relative smoothness of the extant first official documents written in German (the influence of the Latin prose tradition is important only from the point of view of style).<sup>55</sup> And no other explanation covers the surprisingly rapid perfecting of the courtly tradition from Veldeke's *Servatius* onwards.

A certain archaic flavor is also noticeable even in the very earliest documents: this would seem to point to a continuous tradition, probably (as Jellinek says) in the literary *Schreibstuben*, such as copied out, e.g., the pre-courtly epics. But it also shows the traditionalist character of writing in general: writing has to be learned, generally from copy-book examples which are themselves generally copied from older copy books.<sup>56</sup>

I could instance the tardy development of the writing tradition throughout German, but especially during the period between O.H.G. and M.H.G. usage is unchanged even when the letters have long since lost their original meaning.<sup>57</sup> Note especially the weakened *e*-endings in the unstressed syllable, which in both dialect and literary language became the reduced vowel *ə* (Kauffmann believes the sentence rhythm caused the weakening) but which were written either as *e* or, if the scribe had learned that spelling, in the traditional O.H.G. forms.<sup>58</sup> Bavarian texts keep undiphthongized *i*, *û*, *iu* beside their diphthongized forms *ei*, *au*, *äu*; e.g., in Lutwin's *Adam und Eva*:

<sup>53</sup> Singer, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

<sup>54</sup> J. Kapteyn, "Zu O. Behaghels Aufsatz," *PBB*, 57 (1933), 434.

<sup>55</sup> Henzen, *op. cit.*, p. 53; and M. H. Jellinek, "Kritik v. A. Bernts: Entstehung unsrer Sprache," *AfdA*, 54 (1935), 28.

<sup>56</sup> H. Fischer, "Rezension von Kauffmanns Geschichte d. Schweizer Mundarten," *Germania*, 36 (1891), 435-36; and A. Heusler, "Kritik v. R. Brandstetter," *AfdA*, 20 (1894), 27.

<sup>57</sup> Kaufmann, *op. cit.*, p. 466.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 474 and 499.

*bûch*, *fluoch* beside the dialectal *sûmt*, *troumt*.<sup>50</sup> In the Alsatian dialect of Wisse and Colin (the *Parzival* epigoni, 1331-1336) we find long *a* beside the form which approaches *ô*; e.g., *hân*, *man*, *hât*, *stat* beside *nâch*; *sôch*, *râte*: *brôte*; cf. the Austrian forms *jâren*: *gebôren* beside *nâch*: *gemach*.<sup>51</sup> This proves a clearly recognizable tradition of writing which is not, however, general but, as the official documents clearly show, dependent on local writing traditions.<sup>52</sup> Behaghel,<sup>53</sup> for example, who worked hard at this facet of the problem, noted in the contemporary Austrian documents a preference for the prefix *der-* for *er-*: *derliuhtet* for *erliuhtet* and a tendency to render the voiceless *tenuis* in the *Anlaut* as *p* (except in a few ceremonial words such as *Bischof*).

We have here a body of proof for M.H.G. writing traditions, but our purpose is better served by the widely noticeable deviations from the dialects as already noted: writers from the different areas all avoid on principle the most obvious provincialisms of their birthplace. A concession to the eye also (which is otherwise little rhymed for in M.H.G.) is the writing of some vowels in a way opposed to their whole course of development: where some L.G. writers rhyme modified *o* and *u* with unmodified *o* and *u* without adding the umlaut, they are clearly feeling that at least the rhyme looks pure!<sup>54</sup> Cf. the Alemanic writers with their O.H.G. *â*, which in their dialect in M.H.G. was moving towards *ô* but was most often in the MSS rendered as long *a*, presumably just because the scribes were used to render this sound as *a* rather than *o*, e.g., *hâte*: *Clarâte* and *hat*: *stât* beside the more consequent *plâne*; *schône*, *râte*: *brôte*, *wâren*: *gebôren*.

The literary influence is probable where Veldeke rhymes the more convenient (or elegant?) *sprach* instead of his Neth. *sprak* with *sach*. Cf. also Wolfram who uses several forms foreign to his dialect, e.g., *began* (seven times), *gât* (three times): in the forms already quoted from Hartmann—*seit* and *saget*—there is probably at least one form foreign to his dialect.<sup>55</sup> The inter-provincial character of the M.H.G. texts is shown where Bavarians use the easy Alem. rhymes *gan* and *stan* instead of the dialectal *gên* and *stên* and, conversely, where the Alemanic writers use Bavarian *gên* and *stên* to get them out of awkward rhymes.<sup>56</sup> There are many signs of the gradual spread north and east of the diminutive *-lîn* as well as of the U.G. reception of rhymes like *gesat*: *stat* from the Lower Rhine area.<sup>57</sup>

Lower Saxony is an interesting test case in this investigation, for everything that we have from Lower Germany up to the decline of

<sup>50</sup> Götze, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

<sup>51</sup> *Idem*.

<sup>52</sup> For all this see Singer, *op. cit.*, pp. 126-27.

<sup>53</sup> *Der Stand* . . . , p. 282.

<sup>54</sup> Singer, *op. cit.*, pp. 126-27.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 131 and 139.

<sup>56</sup> Paul, *Grammatik*, p. 119.

<sup>57</sup> Singer, *op. cit.*, pp. 131 and 139.

the U.G. chivalry and its culture has come down to us in some kind of H.G. literary language. In other words, the culture-bearing stratum of Lower Saxony attempted to conform to the particular civilization of Upper Germany, and its literature was transmitted in a language of which there is almost no trace in the official documents of the area: the latter show L.G. forms and belong to a L.G. prose tradition which had been developing earlier but yielded ground at this point to H.G. forms (at least for the cultural purposes of the knightly stratum). Together with the *Minnedienst* and the chivalric system, Lower Saxony borrowed the literary vocabulary of Upper Germany and thus gave us a palpable example of what I have been attempting to prove for other areas: the watering-down of local forms in favor of a common ideal and notably (for our purposes) the elements of a M.H.G. written language.

But the lack of precisely this written language is demonstrated by the fact that the Saxons found no uniform U.G. tradition to borrow. Veldeke borrowed first the Middle Franconian language of the precourtly epic, as did Eilhart von Oberg for his *Tristrant*, and Veldeke, with his flair for the needs of the moment, proceeded to approach more and more closely the U.G. literary tradition. But very few Lower Saxons followed him—only Berthold von Holle and Heinrich von Morungen seem certain. The others followed various M.H.G. traditions. They took over a foreign pattern but not a really uniform pattern—which is the picture we get at all points of the M.H.G. literary tradition.<sup>67</sup>

Henzen says of the written language: "It forms a tradition and has as a consequence certain archaic traits."<sup>68</sup> The M.H.G. writers did not employ everything that was common in their dialects but borrowed archaic traits showing a partly literary and partly orthographical tradition. But they used nothing which would have been absolutely foreign to their dialect. And we find precisely in the greatest poets (especially in Wolfram) a striving to mold language, to remain free of linguistic conventions. It is one of the greatest stumbling blocks to the reading of *Parzival* that Wolfram wrote so much of it in a language with marked dialectal peculiarities. Hartmann and Walther must also have refused to be bound—but what they opposed to archaic tradition was not a mere peasant dialect; it was a "personal language, enlivened by life in 'Society' and purified by self-discipline" (Henzen).<sup>69</sup>

The orthography of sounds within this line of argument is worthy of treatment by itself:<sup>70</sup> Kraus argued the U.G. character of the

<sup>67</sup> For the Low Saxons, see Behaghel, "Zu H. v. Büchel," *Germania*, 36 (1891); W. Grimm, *Kleinere Schriften*, III (Berlin, 1883), 214-38 (especially pp. 218-19); Paul, *Grammatik*, p. 119; and Götze, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

<sup>68</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 53.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 58.

<sup>70</sup> Höfler, *op. cit.*, p. 57.



original form of Veldeke's *Eneit* from the metrical form, not from the language: it would indeed seem more likely that poets who subordinate themselves to a written language (only assumed, in any case) should adopt the more intellectually amenable vocabulary and diction rather than the strange sounds of foreign dialects—a fortiori, of course, the scribes would do so. Uniformity is thus conceivable without its touching the sounds; however, in fact, the poets show a finer feeling for e.g., *e*-sounds than do the official documents—and they are remarkably consistent: the poets distinguish four *e*-rhymes, the documents only two.<sup>71</sup>

There are unfortunately no direct confessions from M.H.G. poets that they are following a uniform literary tradition—Hartmann's above-quoted remarks on Veldeke at least allow one confidently to presume that this was his aim. Gottfried's famous review of his predecessors and contemporaries shows a suspiciously accurate knowledge of German dialects and stylistic traditions—I use the word “suspiciously” in the sense that it may be argued from this that all, and especially the great, poets were similarly preoccupied with questions of language.

Three later poets are, however, interesting witnesses.<sup>72</sup> It is, of course, a pity that they are only epigoni—this does not allow us to link them directly with the masters—but at least they prove that in their own period they were following techniques investigated by the masters. First, Albrecht von Halberstadt:

Der sine sinne an ditze bûch  
ze rehte hât gevlizzen,  
der er ist, sult ir wizzen:  
enweder dirre zweier,  
weder Swâp noch Beier  
weder Dürinc noch Franke.  
Des lât û sin zu danke,  
ob ir vundet in den rimen  
die sich zeinander limen  
valsch oder unreht.  
Wan ein sahse, heizet Albrecht,  
geboren von Halberstat  
û ditze bûch gemachet hat.

The least that can be said of this passage is that it is remarkable that the poet recognizes dialectal peculiarities in *rimen*. As all Albrecht's known work has U.G. forms, it is probable that this is really an excuse, in the face of tacitly accepted U.G. regulation (of

<sup>71</sup> See especially K. Bohnenberger, “Über gât/gêt im Bairischen,” *PBB*, 22 (1897); G. Ehrismann, “Rezension v. Rosenhagens D.T.M., Bd. 17,” *AfdA*, 35 (1912); Jellinek, *op. cit.*, p. 28; and Singer, *op. cit.*, pp. 124-25.

<sup>72</sup> Pietsch, *op. cit.*, p. 7, quotes a further passage from Hugo von Trimberg's *Renner* but disposes of it in the same article.

*rimen* especially). Otherwise we should expect Saxon linguistic peculiarities—which are nowhere to be found.<sup>73</sup>

Second, in the preface to Ebernand von Erfurt's *Heinrich und Kunigunde* there is an even more remarkable passage:

Ich bin ein Dürenc von art geborn:  
hête ich die spräche nu verkorn  
und hête mine zungen  
an ander wort getwungen—  
war zuo wêre mir daz guot?  
ich wêne er effenliche tuot,  
der sich der sprache zucket an,  
der er nicht gefuogen kan.

Naumann insists in this context on Ebernand's strongly dialectal language which reflects his own position, his solitary personality with its penchant for mysticism. This makes his remarks all the more important, for we see here a solitary mystic obliged to excuse himself and saying that he is a "nonconformer" by choice.<sup>74</sup> (It is only fair to add that the quotation has also been regarded as an address apologizing to the Babenbergs for a Middle German's treating a Bamberg legend despite his dialectal imperfections.<sup>75</sup>)

The third passage comes from Der Teichner, a Viennese poet who did not begin writing until the Habsburg period. This circumstance is important, for the passage runs:

Sô spricht der drit: ez waere kluoc,  
swaz er ret von manegen sachen  
künde erz niuwan swaebisch machen  
nâch der lantsprâch ûf und ab.

The interpretation of this passage depends on the word "lantsprâch": it can hardly mean a literary language—for it is clear that he is being "literary" by his mere form. It must refer, therefore, to a popular manner of speaking (cf. the *vlaemen* mode), a most likely conjecture for the Vienna of this period where one may assume that the Swabian (Alemannic) of the Habsburgs and their retinue was threatening in these circles to supplant the native Bavarian-Austrian.<sup>76</sup>

The three passages are none of them conclusive but are of a piece with my earlier remarks on the great consideration shown linguistic differences in M.H.G. Kraus adds a number of quotations from sixteenth and seventeenth-century writers who strove very consciously to be generally comprehensible all over Germany, notably the following from Christian Weise: "Wer sich aber die Gedanken macht, daß er sein Licht im gantzen Deutschlande wil leuchten lassen, der muß auff dergleichen Reime denken, die sich an allen Orten annehmlich

<sup>73</sup> A much-discussed passage. See Götze, *op. cit.*, p. 15; Paul, *Gab es . . .*, pp. 10-14; and R. Heinzel, "Besprechung v. PBB I," *Zs. f. d. öst. Gymnasium*, 25 (Wien, 1874), 173.

<sup>74</sup> Kraus, *op. cit.*, pp. 172-73.

<sup>75</sup> See, especially, Paul, *Gab es . . .*, pp. 10-14.

<sup>76</sup> Paul, *idem*; Götze, *op. cit.*, p. 15.



und bewehrt finden."<sup>77</sup> Conditions were, one must insist on this, not so different with regard to minority cultures throughout the twelfth to the seventeenth centuries.

It is, however, precisely the subterfuges and pedantry which M.H.G. poets had to use which prove the absence of one uniform ruling. Had there been one, it would not have been necessary to avoid words which might lead to misunderstandings. This must be the conclusion even though words like *klâr* and *gnêdic*, which grow from literary importations to be common usage, show that the literary language was on the way to becoming this common usage. And there is the ghost of a uniformity—of a ghostly, embryonic, courtly unity—behind all the formal details. As W. Scherer wrote:

There was indeed no really firm and regular written language separated from the dialects. But the court-language, with its tendency to expand and become the common language, colours many of the dialects as soon as they are written down: it modifies them, gives them a uniform cast, softens eccentricities, erodes oddities . . . on the whole it is, despite everything, *one language*, indubitably recognisable as such, a vehicle for literature and culture, distinct from the rough popular dialects.<sup>78</sup>

This may be taken as the last word—and a study of the *Zeitgeist* should have shown that to philologists before the arrival of the School of Burdach! But the question was complicated by vague conceptions and by the variegated history of the chivalric society which had such a short life and disappeared so thoroughly<sup>79</sup>—and, as Naumann says: "The courtly language disappeared with the courtly culture. The vessel burst because it could not hold the new wine."<sup>80</sup> Pfeiffer foresaw this conclusion with his valuable remark: "Every language undergoes alterations during its lifetime: these follow faster or slower according to the greater or lesser violence of the changes, political, social and literary, which pass over the life and culture of the people."<sup>81</sup> Kraus concludes: "In this sense we may speak of a M.H.G. literary language. But we must beware of envisaging it as comparable in kind with our N.H.G."<sup>82</sup> The written tradition (both orthographical and purely literary) does exist therefore, and even from pre-M.H.G. times, and it did gain ground—softening dialectal differences in favor of a common norm of good German. Its fitful appearances in M.H.G. times mark a phenomenon symptomatic of the social and political evolution of Germany.

University of Melbourne

<sup>77</sup> Kraus, *op. cit.*, p. 160.

<sup>78</sup> *Die deutsche Spracheinheit* (Berlin, 1874), p. 52.

<sup>79</sup> Pietsch, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

<sup>80</sup> *Geschichte*, pp. 20-21.

<sup>81</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 320. See also V. Michels, "Stand und Aufgaben der Sprachwissenschaft," in *Streitberg-Festschrift* (Heidelberg, 1924).

<sup>82</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 170.

## MORE NOTES TO MARNER'S "MINNELIEDER"

By JOHN LANCASTER RIORDAN

This article presents a continuation of Philipp Strauch's *scolia* to the Marner's songs which he noted in his own *Handexemplar*<sup>1</sup> of the definitive edition.<sup>2</sup> The two previous articles presented the notations for a *Spruch* (Song I)<sup>3</sup> and the two *Tagelieder* (Songs II and III).<sup>4</sup> We now offer addenda to Songs IV, V, VII, VIII, IX, and X, which form a more or less coherent group, with the exception of the Latin panegyric in the last part of X. In a final paper we shall edit Strauch's notes to Songs VI and XI through XV and add our own Marner collectanea for these and Songs I-III.

Although Marner is not a star of the first magnitude like Walther von der Vogelweide, he shines brightly in the galaxy of Middle High German *Spruch*- and *Minnesinger*. He occasionally follows Walther in style and even calls him *mîn meister hêr Walthêr* (XIV, 273 f.). Like his contemporaries, he employs numerous stereotyped locutions and ideas current in the love song. Nevertheless, he frequently offers original thoughts couched in lively verse and gives us several expressions for which we are unable to find parallels in MHG literature. At no time does he slavishly imitate his fellow-poets or precursors. To be sure, in keeping with the style of the times, much of both form and content in his songs is purely formal, yet some personal elements do shimmer through. This is especially true of the didactic poems, in which he alludes to personalities, places, and experiences.

In the notes to IV, 21, a variety of references to the idea that a lover cherishes his lady more than the position of emperor or king, or that she is worthy to be an empress or queen, indicates how widespread this idea was in *Minnesang*, folk songs, and rhymed chronicles. An expression that was common in Old French (*je fuis cil quis*) and which was absorbed into MHG in numerous paraphrases is copiously documented (IV, 34). An ornithologically inclined linguist will find the bird names offered in V, 17, of interest. References are provided for the age-old sentiment that joy is ever linked with sorrow (V, 34-36). Marner's antithetical word-play involving *nein* and *ja* is also shown to have counterparts in other MHG works (VII, 17). Those who desire to trace the motif of the winning of a woman's love through the employment of deception will find a point of departure in note IX, 7 f.

<sup>1</sup> Thanks are due Professor Archer Taylor of the University of California, who has kindly lent me this volume from his private library.

<sup>2</sup> *Der Marner*, "Quellen und Forschungen," XIV (1876).

<sup>3</sup> "Additional Notes to a *Spruch* of der Marner," *MLQ*, III (1942), 605-10.

<sup>4</sup> "Additional Notes to the Marner's 'Tagelieder,'" *MLQ*, VII (1946), 329-36.

Marner's reference (IX, 19 f.) to the nobility of silk and gold is a significant comment on the culture-history of the time, for silk was the characteristic cloth and gold the metal of the knightly class. Every escutcheon displayed silver or gold in some fashion. Gold on the right side indicated that the knight had performed brave deeds in the service of king or emperor. Wild animals surrounded by gold signified high nobility, but a gold field was nobler than a golden figure on the shield. Although silver was similarly employed, it never achieved equal importance. A knight who was eligible to use gold in his coat-of-arms, yet who did not "practice knighthood," carried a yellow color instead of gold.<sup>5</sup> Especially illuminating is a didactic passage quoted from *Ritterspiegel*:<sup>6</sup> The knight bears gold sequins on his clothing. Gold, the symbol of the sun, can be drawn out into thin threads. This signifies the patience of the knight. In the fire gold loses none of its weight, nor does rust tarnish it. Likewise the knight should not allow his heart to be tarnished by the rust of hate, nor squander his manhood in warring.

Even in medieval times it could be said that "gentlemen prefer blondes," for just as gold was the noblest personal adornment and decoration on the family coat-of-arms, so also was golden blond hair regarded as the most aristocratic and beautiful (IX, 37).

At the beginning of his tenth song, Marner equates a number of sententious antitheses to happiness and sadness in human relationships. In the notes the reader will encounter parallels to these ideas (X, 3-7). The brief love song in the first fourteen lines of Song X has no connection with the Latin passage extending from line 15 through 56. The latter is a saccharine panegyric to a *nobilum prelatum de Solio*. Little of significance appears in the body of this eulogy, though the closing lines offer an interesting formula of superlative praise:

Huic ignoro parem  
 circiter per totam Carinthiam,  
 Si perambularem  
 Saxones, Francos et Bawariam.  
 Swevos, Rhenum, fertilem Alsatiam.

A comparison of this locution with similar ones in Provençal and MHG texts reveals a peculiar geographical consciousness expressed in a common literary formula. Of the examples cited, most whimsical is the parody on this construction by the anonymous author of *Der Weinschwelg*, an affable toper who praises the virtues of wine above all else and eulogizes his own drinking capacity above that of anyone in *Pâris, Padouwe, Tervûs, Rôme*, and *Tuscân*.

In keeping with Strauch's original *Anmerkungen*, I have written the notes in German and indicated the songs and verses after Strauch's arrangement.

<sup>5</sup> Karl Bartsch, ed., *Mitteldeutsche Gedichte*, "Bibliothek des Literarischen Vereins," LIII (1860), xxv, and notes to IX, 19 f., in this paper.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, LIII, xxix, and vv. 1583-1764.

## IV

1. Konrad der Schenke von Landeck, *HMS*, I, 359, Str. XVII, 1 f.: *Ich wil aber singen, / wan ez ist mir in dem muote.*
6. Karl F. Kummer, *Die poetischen Erzählungen des Herrand von Wildonie und die kleinen innerösterreichischen Minnesinger* (Wien: Holder, 1880), S. 219, Anm. zu 5, 5 bietet die Anrede *leien* im Reime bei verschiedenen Minnesingern.
- 8-10. Vgl. Karl F. Kummer, *dass.*, S. 220, Anm. zu Stadecke 5, 7. Zur Frauenschminke im Mittelalter: Wilhelm Wackernagel, *Kleinere Schriften*, I (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1872), 159 ff., wo weitere Belege zu finden sind.
- 21 f. Zum Gedanken "Und böte man mir ein Königreich, ich gäbe ihre Liebe nicht darum," vgl. folgendes: Ferdinand Michel, *Heinrich von Morungen und die Troubadours. Ein Beitrag zur Betrachtung des Verhältnisses zwischen deutschem und provenzalischem Minnesang*, "Quellen und Forschungen," XVIII (1880), 42 ff.: *si ist aller wibe ein kröne*, uam. Karl Lachmann, *Des Minnesangs Frühling; mit Bezeichnung der Abweichungen von Lachmann und Haupt, unveränderte Textausgabe nach der Neubearbeitung von F. Vogt mit einer Einleitung von Carl von Kraus* (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1935), S. 157 (Heinrich von Morungen), Str. 138, 22 ff.: *wê wie tuon sô, daz ich sô herzeclîche / bin an si verdâht daz ich ein künicrîche / für ir minne nicht ennemen wolde*; S. 123 (Heinrich von Rugge), Str. 108, 3 ff.: *die wile ich si vermiden muoz / von der mir sanfter taete ein gruoiz / an deme staeten herzen mîn / dann ich ze Rôme keiser solte sîn*; (Keiser Heinrich), Str. 5, 36 f.: *êh ich mich ir verzige, ich verzige mich ê der krône*; (Heinrich von Veldeke), Str. 63, 30: *solte ich ze Rôme tragen krône, ich gesatztes ûf ir houbet*. Richard Werner, *AnzfdA*, VII (1881), 136 f., bietet anderweitige mittelhochdeutsche, altfranzösische und provenzalische Parallelen zu dieser Redensart. Rudolf Minzloff, *Bruder Hansens Marienlieder aus dem vierzehnten Jahrhundert* (Hannover: Hahn, 1863), S. 263, Vv. 3657 ff.: *Uph daz ich sam yr dienre wurd gelonet / Daz wer mich werlîch lieber / Den ich zu Romen keyser wurt gecronet*. Edward Schröder, *Die Kaiserchronik eines Regensburger Geistlichen*, "Monumenta Germaniae Historica," I, 1 (Hannover: Hahn, 1892), 165, V. 4562: *sie zaeme wol ze ainer kuniginne allen Rômaeren*. Ludwig Wolff, *Die Gandersheimer Reimchronik des Priesters Eberhard* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1927), S. 10, Vv. 201 ff.: *unde were't, dat men des in der werlde plege, / dat men der vrômecheit kônnicrike geve, / dannonch möchte se sîn gewesen kônniginne*. Ludwig Weiland, *Braunschweigische Reimchronik*, "Monumenta Germaniae Historica," II (Hannover: Hahn, 1877), 464b, Vv. 434 ff.: *phlege dher keyser durch werldicheyt / noch konincriche geben / se were koniginne bleben / durch aller tugent edhelicheyt*. Johann Schmeller, *Carmina Burana. Lateinische und deutsche Lieder und Gedichte einer Handschrift des XIII. Jahrhunderts aus Benedictbeuern*, "Bibliothek des Literarischen Vereins," XVI (1847), 123, Nr. 36, Vv. 24 ff.: *Plus amarem / plus optarem / sui verbi dona / quam si mundi / vi jocundi / jungerer corona*. Fritz Behrend und Rudolf Wolkan, *Der Ehrenbrief des*

*Püterich von Reichertshausen* (Weimar: Gesellschaft der Bibliophilen, 1920), S. 19, Str. 27: *Römischen reiches khrone / und wär ich der gewaltig, / nāmb ich nit für den lone, / den mir leicht put die eren manigfaltig.* Johannes Crueger, "Das erste neuhochdeutsche Minnelied," *ZfdPh*, XVI (1884), 87, Vv. 30 ff.: *Sie lohnet mir so lieblich, / Daß, eh ich sie verließe, / So ließ ich eh die Krone.* Ludwig Uhland, *Alte hoch- und niederdeutsche Volkslieder* (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1881), S. 104, Nr 71, Str. 3, 7 ff.: *noch ist der knab so wol gmut, / für in nām ich nits keisers gut.*

W. Wilmanns-V. Michels, *Walther von der Vogelweide*, "Germanistische Handbibliothek, I, 2" (4te vollst. umgearb. Aufl., Halle: Waisenhaus, 1924), S. 248 zu 63, 5 ff.: *der keiser wurde ir spileman / um alsô wünnecliche gebe; ebenda., S. 309, zu Vv. 83, 35 f.: den möht ein keiser nemen wol / an sinen höhsten rāt.* Richard M. Meyer, *Die Reihenfolge der Lieder Neidharts von Reuenthal* (Berliner Diss., Berlin: Grunert, 1883), S. 56, zu 41, 14 f.: *sist ein wîp daz ir kîp zaeme wol / se menne einem grāven.* Friedrich Diez, *Leben und Werke der Troubadors. Ein Beitrag zur näheren Kenntnis des Mittelalters* (2te verm. Aufl. v. Karl Bartsch, Leipzig: Barth, 1882), S. 177 (zu Bertran von Born): *Dient es der römischen Krone selbst zum Ruhme, / wird sie euch aufs Haupt gesetzt.* Harald Graef, *Erasmus. Deutsches Gedicht des dreizehnten Jahrhunderts*, "Quellen und Forschungen," L (1883), 186, Vv. 3048 f.: *ich wolde roemisch rîche / versuern durch sie menegiu jār.* Weiteres bei Arnold Berger, "Die volkstümlichen Grundlagen des Minnesangs," *ZfdPh*, XIX (1887), 454. Konrad Burdach, *Reinmar der Alte und Walther von der Vogelweide. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Minnesangs* (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1880), S. 34 und Anm. 12.

34. Diese anscheinliche deutsche Redensart ist dem Altfranzösischen nachgebildet (z.B. *je fuis cil quis*), da solche Wendungen erst in der höfischen Zeit vorkommen. Die mittelhochdeutsche Literatur bietet reichliches Material aus den verschiedensten Gattungen: Moriz Haupt, *Erec. Eine Erzählung von Hartmann von Aue* (2te Ausg., Leipzig: Hirzel, 1871), V. 1218: *den ich da meine das bin ich; 1239: ich binz der iu widerreit; 6965: ich binz den ir dā nennet.* G. F. Benecke und Karl Lachmann, *Iwein. Eine Erzählung von Hartmann von Aue* (5te Ausg., Berlin u. Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1926), 2468: *der iuch dā richet, das bin ich; 4031: wan der vervluochte das bin ich.* Karl Lachmann, *Wolfram von Eschenbach* (6te Ausg., Berlin und Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1930), Str. 299, 26: *ich pin der dir ie dienst pôt; 334, 12: ich pin der dā versümet was; 476, 24: ich enbinz niht der dā triegen kan; 545, 16: der sich diss orses nietet, / das pin ich; 555, 4: ich pin dius nimmer iu vergiht.* W. Wilmanns-V. Michels, aaO. (vgl. Anm. IV, 21 oben), S. 230, 56, 15: *der iu maere bringet, das bin ich; S. 378, 111, 29: ich bin der im ez versprechen muoz.* Das seltene Praeteritum kommt bei Walther 40, 29 vor: *der ie streit umb iuwer ère / wider unstaete liute, das was ich.* Wilmanns zitiert auch Reinmar, 168, 24: *diu in iemer weinet, das bin ich; 188, 28: ich bin der sis versuigen sol; Morungen, 140, 30: ich binz der ir dienen wil; Neidhart, 169, 47: ich bin ir einer der noch hiut dîn laster rechen wil.* Ernst Martin, *Deutsches Heldenbuch* (Berlin, 1886), II, V. 2762

(Dietrichs Flucht): *der maere bringet daz bin ich*. G. Baesecke und K. Voretzsch, *Reinhart Fuchs*, "Altdeutsche Textbibliothek," VII (Halle, 1925), Vv. 627 ff.: *ver Hersant dô sprach / 'ich bin diu Reinharten nie gesach, / weiz got, bi drin tagen.'* Die Wendung *ir sit diu öfter* bei Ulrich von Lichtenstein, *Frauendienst*, hrsg. von R. Bechstein, "Deutsche Klassiker des Mittelalters," VI u. VII (Leipzig, 1888). Karl Lucae, *Der Weinschwelg. Ein altdeutsches Gedicht aus der zweiten Hälfte des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1886), V. 246: *ich bin der trinkens gert*. Gustav Knod, *Gottfried von Neifen und seine Lieder. Eine literarhistorische Untersuchung* (Tübingen: Fues, 1877), S. 63 f. bietet folgendes aus Gottfried von Neifen: 19, 6: *die ich mit triuwen meine*; 49, 18: *diu ich mit ganzen triuwen iemer meine*; 35, 21: *diech vor allen wiben meine*; 11, 24: *Minne, du weist wol es ist diu liebe, di ich dâ meine*; 13, 7: *nâch der lieben diech dâ meine*; auch 29, 25. Wörtlich kehrt *Diu ich mit triuwen meine* beim Grafen von Kirchberg wieder, vgl. Karl Bartsch, *Deutsche Liederdichter des 12.-14. Jahrhunderts*. (4te Ausg., Berlin, 1901), 261, 42, wie auch bei Conrad von Altstetten, ebenda., 276, 23. Otto mit dem Pfeil, ebenda., 252, *hat sie ist die ich mit ganzen triuwen meine*. Vgl. auch Wilhelm Wackernagel, *Altfranzösische Lieder und Leiche* (Basel: Schweighauser, 1896), S. 198; Erich Schmidt, *Reinmar von Hagenau und Heinrich von Rugge. Eine literarhistorische Untersuchung*, "Quellen und Forschungen," IV (Straßburg: Trübner, 1874), S. 89 f.

36. Weitere Belege bei W. Wilmanns-V. Michels, *Leben und Dichten Walthers von der Vogelweide*, "Germanistische Handbibliothek, I, 1" (Halle: Waisenhaus, 1916), S. 360, Anm. zu III, 172.

40. J. A. Schmeller, *Carmina Burana. Lateinische und deutsche Lieder und Gedichte einer Handschrift des XIII. Jahrhunderts aus Benedictbeuern*, "Bibl. des Lit. Ver.," XVI (Stuttgart, 1847), 174, Nr 94a, Str. 3, Vv. 5 ff.: *Wil si, ich lebe wol, / daz diene ich immer swie ich sol, / gebiutet si, ich lige tot, / sus leide ich wernde not*.

## V

1. Über die zugrundeliegende mittelalterliche Vorstellung von den Elementen, siehe A. Schönbach zu Strauchs *Marner*, *AnzfdA*, III (1877), 127.

13. Korrigiere *nut* zu *unt*.

14. Rudolf Minzloff, *Bruder Hansens Marienlieder aus dem vierzehnten Jahrhundert* (Hannover: Hahn, 1863), S. 309, Vv. 4398 f.: *Gheel, wüs, zwertz, root, gruen, bruun und bla / Costlûch gezirt von menger verv*. A. Schönbach, *AnzfdA*, III (1877), 128 zitiert Minneburg (3b): *ich sach die blüemelin wedeln / . . . die farwen rôt grûen unde wîs / brûn blâ swarz gel*. Das frühneuhochdeutsche Spiel *Von den sieben Farben*, welches auf eine Nürnberger Vorlage vom Jahre 1450 zurückgeht, stellt die Bedeutungen der Farben plastisch-symbolisch dar. Vgl. Eugen Thurnher, *Wort und Wesen in Südtirol. Die deutsche Dichtung Südtirols im Mittelalter* (Innsbruck, 1947), S. 179. Zur Bibliographie der Farbenkunde vgl. Archer Taylor, *Problems in German Literary History of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries* (New York: Modern Language Association of America,



1939), S. 111, Anm. 93. Siehe auch Strauch, Marnerausgabe, zu VII, 12 ff.

17. Wilhelm Hertz, *Tristan und Isolde von Gottfried von Straßburg* (Stuttgart: Kröner, 1877), rezensiert von Reinhold Bechstein in *Germania*, XXIV (1879), 109, zu *Tristan*, 16895: "Der galander ist vielmehr die große Lerche, Ringlerche, *alouda calandra* Linné, auch *alouda Sibirica*. . ." Franz Pfeiffer, *Heinzelein von Konstanz* (Leipzig: Weigel, 1852), S. 25 f., Vv. 616 ff.: *Manic vogel kleine / saz uf der selben kröne / . . . droschel unde nahtegal / amsel und galander / vinke, lerche und ander.*

34-36. F. Arnold Mayer und Heinrich Rietsch, *Die Mondsee-Wiener Liederhandschrift und der Mönch von Salzburg. Eine Untersuchung zur Litteratur- und Musikgeschichte. Nebst den zugehörigen Texten aus der Handschrift*, S. 395 f. zu Nr 14, V. 33, weitere Belege zum Gedanken "Leid ist mit Freud' verkettet." Daß diese weltliche Antithese von Freude und Leid der geistlichen Askese des Mittelalters (Himmelfreude und Erdenleid) entstammt, tut Karl Korn dar: *Studien über "Freude und Trüben" bei mittelhochdeutschen Dichtern: Beiträge zu einer Problemgeschichte* (1934). Dazu G. Ehrismann, *LitlGRPhil* (1934), 9-10, S. 296 f. Vgl. Strauch, *Marner*, aaO., IV, 17.

## VII

1 f. Vgl. Ulrich von Winterstetten, *HMS*, I, 157b, XXI, Vv. 1-4: *Sumer, diner lieben künfte / bin ich vro, du hast gewalt / diner hohen sigenünfte / vröut sich anger und der walt.*

3 f. Konrad der Schenk von Landeck, *HMS*, I, 354b, VII, 2, 1 f.: *Swer den winter trurik waere, / der sol nu des meien vröuwen sich.*

17. Zu antithetischen Wortspielen auf *jâ* und *nein*, vgl. folgendes: Karl Bartsch, *Reinfrid von Braunschweig*, "Bibl. des Lit. Ver.," CIX (Tübingen: Fues, 1871), 144, Vv. 4892 ff.: *Wizzend daz diu minne / neinâ ist wan an den zwein, / denn ein jâ, denn ein nein.* Karl Stejskal, *Hadamars von Laber Jagd* (Wien: Holder, 1880), S. 99, Str. 384: *Swer frägt in rehtem meinen / dâ gën nein jâ gehoeret, / wil aber jâ sich neinen, / sô wirt jâ und nein ir kraft zerstoert. / fund ich dâ ja, aldâ nein ist behüset / und nein, dâ jâ sol wesen, / ab der geselleschaft mir immer grüset.* Friedrich Scholl, *Diu Crône von Heinrich von dem Türkin*, "Bibl. des Lit. Ver.," XXVII (Stuttgart, 1852), Vv. 113 f.: *Die zwei ziehent nicht einen / Einez jâ, daz ander nein; Vv. 1918 ff.: Daz ein herze unde ein mut / Sie beide merket sunder mein, / Ein jâ und ein nein; V. 8422 f.: Ir beider lip wart in ein, / Eines willen, nicht und jâ.* Siehe auch Erich Schmidt, *Reinmar*, usw. (oben zu Anm. IV, 34), 115 f. B. Greif, *Germania*, XVII (1872), 442 f. gibt ein kurzes aus dem fünfzehnten Jahrhundert stammendes Gedicht heraus, welches den Titel "Nein und Ja" führt: *Nein und Ja / sunt duo contraria. / Nein ist gern allain, / . . . aber Ja pringt in musica / vil gaudia*, usf.

19. Karl Bartsch, *Deutsche Liederdichter*, usw. (s. oben zu IV, 34), S. 208, Vv. 24 f.: *die man die können liegen / dâ von lâ dich niht triegen.* K. Kummer, *Die poetischen Erzählungen des Herrand von*

*Wildonie* (Wien: Hölder, 1880), S. 217, Anm. zu 5, 5 (der von Scharphenberc); *HMS*, I, 291a (Singenberg): *ich hân gesworn, daz ich vor löser manne tücke mich behüete.*

28. Karl Lachmann, *Wolfram von Eschenbach* (6te Ausg., Berlin u. Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1930), S. 5, Vv. 18 f.: *ich ger (mir wart ouch nie diu gir / verhabet) min ougen swingen dar.*

## VIII

15. Schenk Ulrich von Winterstetten, *HMS*, I, 147b, Str. 3, 6: *nu nimet si min niht war.*

18 f. Graf Konrad von Kilchberg, *HMS*, I, 24b, Str. 3, 1 f.: *Swanne ich ir minne ger / so vraget si, was minne si.*

20. Weitere Belege zu dieser Stelle bei Konrad Burdach, *Reinmar*, usw. (s. oben zu IV, 21 f.), S. 74.

21 f. K. Lachmann, *Minnesangs Frühling* (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1888), S. 136, V. 21 (Heinrich von Morungen): *wie ich si minne und wiech ir holdes herze trage; HMS*, I, 77b (Rudolf von Rotenburg): *daz ich ir holdes herze trage; K. F. Kummer* zu Herrand von Wildonie (s. oben zu IV, 6), S. 217, Nr 6, 3 u. 11.

28-30. K. Frommann, "Das Münchener Liederbuch," *ZfdPh*, XV (1883), 122, Vv. 21 f.: *wer freuen ert der wirt gewert / was er von yn begeret.* Auch S. 122, Vv. 13 ff.: *Als das ich von ir begert / was ich stetiglich gewert / sy wolt mir keynsz vorsagen.*

## IX

5 f. *Mönch von Salzburg* (siehe zu V, 34-36 oben), S. 396, Anm. zu Nr 14, V. 40: "Sich zu 'rühmen' ist eines der schwersten Vergehen gegen die höfische Sitte." Weitere Belege werden ebendasselbst angegeben.

7 f. Betrug als Minnemotiv: Arnold Berger, "Die volkstümlichen Grundlagen des Minnesangs," *ZfdPh*, XIX (1887), 464; K. Lachmann, *Wolfram* (s. oben zu VII, 28), S. 89, Str. 172, 13 f.: *Welt ir in gerne liegen, / ir muget ir vil betriegen.* Moritz Haupt, *Erec* (s. oben zu IV, 34), S. 123, Vv. 3848 ff.: *wan ez ist iuwer mane site / daz ir uns arniu wip dâ mite / wil gerne triegent / ichn tar nicht sprechen, liegent).* Siehe auch oben zu VII, 19.

9-12. Franz Pfeiffer, "Altdeutsche Beispiele," *ZfdA*, VII (1849), 338, Vv. 53 f.: *iedoch sol man ir sprechen quot: / er ist saelic swer das tuot / und gewinnet sin frum unt êre.* J. E. Wackernell, *Hugo von Montfort*. "Ältere tirolische Dichter," III (Innsbruck: Wagner, 1881), 49, Nr XVI, Vv. 57 ff.: *Als tuont die wib uff erden hie / vor allen creaturen: / lieben ding gesach ich nie, / si sind zwar quot für trüren.* Weitere Stellen: Berger, *Volkstümliche Grundlage*, aaO. (vgl. zu IX, 7), S. 463.

13-16. (Wie Strauch diese Stelle verstanden hat, ist nicht klar. Sie ist sicher als bedenkliches Wortspiel aufzufassen.) Ignaz V. Zingerle, *Die deutschen Sprichwörter im Mittelalter* (Wien: Braumüller, 1864), S. 165. Siehe auch Berger, aaO. (zu IX, 7), S. 460.

19 f. Das Gold gilt als Abzeichen des Ritterstandes. Gustav Ehrismann, "Zum Seifrid Helbling," *Germania*, XXXIII (1888), 376 f.;



Karl Bartsch, *Mitteldeutsche Gedichte*, "Bibl. des Lit. Ver.," LIII (1860), S. XXVIII ff. (zum Ritterspiegel); Vv. 849 f.: *So stiez em danne an sine hand / Der pristir ein guldin fingirlin*; 1249 ff.: *Man gebit eime ritter daz fingirlin / Von golde und edilime gesteine, / Dit mag das ander kleinote sin / Daz ich an eme ouch meine. / Das fingirlin ist alumne zu, / Sin ring der had kein ende, / Des ritters truwe bedutit ez nu, / Die sal ouch nergin wende*; 1583 ff.: *Bilche tregit der ritter an eme golt / Und spangin an sime gewande / Die lute werdin eme bliche holt, / Wan er nicht ubit schande / Es spricht der meistir Rasis: / Daz golt wechsit von der sunnen*; 1591: *Die sunne das golt us werkit*; 1599 f.: *Nu ist der edilstir planete / Di sunne mit erme golde*; 1607 ff.: *Gedult und schone wisheit / Wo die zusammen werden gewerkit / Daz bedutit wol ein guldin kleit: / Dese bedeutunge eben merkit*; auch 1660 ff.: *Das Gald im Schilde ist Zeichen hohen Adels: ebenda., Vv. 639 ff.: Sie ediln gar sere die schilde, / Sint si mit golde ummeleid. / Vele edelin ist ein guldin feld / Danne ein guldin bilde*; 617 ff.: *Wer danne die rechtin sitin had / Von silbir adir von golde, / Der had begangin die bestin tad / An des konigis solde*. Adelbert von Keller, *Der trojanische Krieg von Konrad von Würzburg*, "Bibl. des Lit. Ver.," XLIV (Stuttgart, 1858), 90, V. 7473: *zuo blâwen siden rôtez golt*. Sammet und Seide sind die edelsten Stoffe, Karl Bartsch, *Die Erlösung, mit einer Auswahl geistlicher Dichtungen*, "Bibliothek der gesamten deutschen National-Literatur," XXXVI (Quedlinburg und Leipzig: Basse, 1858), 192, Nr IV (Marienlied), Vv. 12 f.: *lop reinen frouwen paz an stât / dann samât oder siden*. Zur goldenen Haarfarbe siehe unten zu IX, 37.

37. *Valwe* ist also blondhaarig. Das helle Blond galt im Mittelalter für die schönste und vornehmste Haarfarbe. Siehe Wilhelm Wackernagel, "Die Farben- und Blumensprache des Mittelalters," *Kleine Schriften*, I (Leipzig, 1872), 142-240, besonders S. 164 u. Anm. F. Scholl, *Die Crône*, usw. (vgl. zu VII, 19 oben), Vv. 19059 ff.: *Ez würde ir langes valwez hâr / ûz der swarten sôgar / Geroufet und vervellet*. Otto Warnatsch, *Der Mantel, Bruchstück eines Lanzeletromans, des Heinrich von dem Türlin*, "Germanistische Abhandlungen," II (Breslau: Koebner, 1883), V. 353: *nu gelich golde ein hâr*. A. Schultz, *Das höfische Leben zur Zeit der Minnesinger*, I (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1889), 212, gibt mittelhochdeutsche und altfranzösische Parallele dieses Schönheitsideales. Ferner HMS, I, 307a (Wachsmut von Mülnhausen): *si treit lanc gel valwez hâr; si treit krûs hâr, krisp unde gel*; Karl Bartsch, *Schweizer Minnesänger* (Frauenfeld: Huber, 1886), S. 81, 5, 23 f.: *rôsewengel, mündel rôt si hât, / val hâr lanc*; S. Singer, *Der Tannhäuser* (Tübingen, 1922), III, 37: *ir hâr reitval, ze mâze lanc*; dass., XI, 20: *reitval dîn hâr; rechte als ichs wünschen solde*.

41. Gustav Roethe, *Die Gedichte Reinmars von Zweter* (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1887), S. 426, Nr 31, Vv. 4: *Ir (d.h. der Minne) besem zamt sô wilden man*. Adelbert von Keller, *Erzählungen aus altdeutschen Handschriften*, "Bibl. des Lit. Ver.," XXXV (Stuttgart, 1855), 250, V. 14: *die jungen wilden machstu zam*. Karl Bartsch, *Reinfrid von Braunschweig*, ebenda., CIX (1871), V. 445: *im hat der*

*minne stricke sîn wildes herze gezemet.* Vgl. auch Lexer, *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch*, III (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1878), Sp. 1057.

52. Die Wendung *lichten tage* ist formelhaft. Vgl. F. Kummer aaO. (siehe zu IV, 6 oben), S. 220 f. zu Städeke 6, 2.

## X

1. ff. Schon Docen, *Neuer Literarischer Anzeiger, eine Zeitschrift aus dem Gebiete der Literatur und Kunst*, Jg. 1807, S. 247 f.

3 f. Friedrich Zarncke, *Der Graltempel. Vorstudie zu einer Ausgabe des jüngeren Titarel*, "Abhandlungen der philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Königlichen Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften," VII (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1876), 470, Str. 108, 3: *das ie nâch der sûze gêt das sûren.* F. Lichenstein, *Eilhart von Oberge, Tristan*, "Quellen und Forschungen," XIX (1877), Vv. 2461: *daz sie sangte und suze were. / nu is sie mir leidir wordin swere. / unde als ein ezzich sur.* O. Behaghel, *Heinrich von Veldeke, Eneide* (Heilbronn, 1882), Vv. 10248 ff.: *Minne, du bist noch galle, / Minne, nu wert soete, / dat ich dich loven moete.* F. Scholl, *Diu Crône*, usw. (vgl. zu VII, 17 oben), V. 12526: *weder ze sûeze noch ze sûre*; 13895 ff.: *(Sie) biutet solhe grûeze / Dâ von ein eiter sûeze / Würde, swie es bitter waere*; 17202 ff.: *Swâ minne ist nâchgebûre / Sie werde im alsô sûre, / Swie man spreche, daz sie sûeze sî; Dâ ist ein bitter galle bi, / Diu ir sûeze über ziuhet.* Viktor Junk, *Rudolf von Ems Alexanderlied*, "Bibl. des Lit. Ver.," CCLXXII (1928), Vv. 3243 ff.: *wie Flören und Blanscheflûr / was sûeze und underwîlen sûr / ir lieplich gesellschafft.*

6. Reinhold Bechstein, *Heinrichs von Freiberg Tristan*, "Deutsche Dichtungen des Mittelalters," V (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1877), 264, V. 6640: *dîn sunnenglast des schûres hagel.* A. Schönbach, *Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum*, III (1877), 128.

7. Ein indianisches und ein lappländisches Märchen erklären den Ursprung der schwarzen Spitze des Hermelinschwanzes folgenderweise: Oskar Dähnert, *Natursagen. Eine Sammlung Naturdeutender Sagen, Märchen, Fabeln und Legenden*, Bd. III, *Tiersagen* (Leipzig und Berlin: Teubner, 1910), 1. Teil, S. 70: "Die Erde ist schmal und scharf wie ein Messer. Im Anfange stand die Welt aufrecht und bewegte sich aufwärts und abwärts in Raume. Wenn sie nicht zur Ruhe gekommen wäre, so hätte alles Leben vernichtet werden müssen. Alle Tiere versuchten nacheinander die Welt zur Ruhe zu bringen, aber vergeblich. Zuletzt von allen machte das Hermelin einen Versuch. Sein Schwanz berührte die gestaltlose Unterlage, über welcher die Welt sich auf und ab bewegte und an der es sie befestigen wollte mit seinem Schwanze. Daher wurde seine Spitze schwarz." (Sage der Tlingit.)

Ebenda., S. 74: "In demselben Augenblicke wurde der Lappe das Hermelin und die Maus gewahr . . . ergriff daher den Haken, an dem der Kochtopf über dem Feuer hing, und schlug damit nach dem Hermelin. Allein er traf es bloß an der Schwanzspitze, und deshalb ist nur diese schwarz geblieben." (Aus einer längeren Märchen der

Lappen in Westfinnmarken.) Vgl. F. Liebrecht, "Läppländische Märchen," *Germania*, XV (1870), 166.

14. J. E. Wackernell, *Hugo von Montfort*, usw. (vgl. oben zu IX, 9-12), S. 8, Nr II, Vv. 89 f.: *frow, ir gend mir üwern segen, / wann ich wil rechter triuwen phlegen*. Weiteres bei Mayer und Rietsch, aaO. (siehe oben zu V, 34-36), S. 419, Anm. zu Nr 32, Vv. 1 ff.; Walter de Gruyter, *Das deutsche Tagelied* (Leipziger Diss., 1887), S. 39.

15. Karl Bartsch, "Alt- und Mittelhochdeutsches aus Engelberg," *Germania* XVIII (1873), 57; W. Gemoll, "Der Vers von vier Hebungen und die Langzeile," *Germania*, XIX (1874), 41; *Verzeichnis der Handschriften der Sankt Galler Stiftsbibliothek* (1875), S. 524b bietet zahlreiche lateinische Hymnen und Sequenzen, die mit *Pange lingua* anfangen.

50 ff. Wilhelm Nickel, *Sirventes und Spruchdichtung*, "Palaestra," LXIII (Berlin: Mayer und Muller, 1907), 24 Anm., gibt provenzalische und mittelhochdeutsche Belege dieser Formel. Karl Julius Schröer, *Der Weinschwelg, mittelhochdeutsch und neuhochdeutsch* (Jena: Frommann, 1876), S. 32, Vv. 299 ff.: *ich weiz wol, dâ z' Parîs / ze Padûwe und ze Terwîs, / ze Rôme und ze Tuscân, / vindet man deheinen man, / ich ensî sîn meister gewesen, / daz mir nie gein einer vesen / ir deheiner mohte gelîchen*.

University of Virginia

## ASPECTS OF THE COMIC IN PULCI AND RABELAIS

By B. F. BART

The relations between Pulci and Rabelais, between Morgante and Pantagruel, have proved a challenging problem in the evaluation of literary influence. The presence in Rabelais' works of characters and events perhaps drawn from Pulci has occasioned sharp dispute over the Frenchman's originality.<sup>1</sup> But the important issue is the use to which he put the material, for the comic in Rabelais bears little relation to that in Pulci. The works start from opposite poles and meet only on a restricted ground, where each of the authors is completely conditioned by his approach. Rabelais, in the Prologue to the First Book, makes clear that he is writing a humorous work for the hearty enjoyment of his readers, but a work in which *la drogue dedans contenue est bien d'autre valeur que ne promettait la boîte*: a humorous garb for serious thought. Pulci takes his stand with equal forthrightness in his *Proemio*. He will tell an epic of chivalry; humor can be but incidental to him. Herein lies the core of the different aspects of the comic for Pulci and Rabelais. But a difference in temperament, too, intervenes. Rabelais is a bubbling, overflowing master of humor; Pulci, "sire of the half-serious rhyme." This difference will be paramount when the limits imposed upon Pulci do not exclude him from Rabelais' ground.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The issue was first systematically raised in an article by Pietro Toldo ("L'Arte italiana nell'opera di Francesco Rabelais," *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literatur*, C [1898], 103-48), claiming all the glory of invention for Italian predecessors, but graciously allowing the Frenchman "la ricchezza della lingua et l'efficacia dello stile." Sainéan ("Les Sources modernes du roman de Rabelais," *Revue des études rabelaisiennes*, X [1912], 375-420) picked up the gauntlet, accusing Toldo of confusing psychological analogies with literary borrowing, and concluding that there is nothing to prove that Rabelais ever read Pulci, much less borrowed from him! Other authors, summarizing the Italian influence on Rabelais, accept and amplify the conclusions of Toldo (e.g., C. del Fiume, *De l'influence de quelques auteurs italiens sur François Rabelais* [Firenze: G. Ramella, 1918]). Alone among the critics, Plattard has risen above nationalistic prejudices to consider objectively the importance of Pulci in the work of Rabelais. His conclusions may be summarized as a recognition that certain episodes are probably drawn from Pulci, whom Rabelais had presumably read, but that the characters have changed psychologically. Although these conclusions appear in Plattard's doctoral thesis published in 1909 (*L'invention et la composition dans l'œuvre de Rabelais* [Paris, Champion]), they have been little noticed by the majority of later critics.

<sup>2</sup> An element of confusion arises from the mode of composition used by both authors. For Rabelais, as for Pulci, the work represents a development over years, an evolving and a changing concept. The similarities are greatest between the earlier products. Rabelais is most clearly humorous, most *bouffon*, in Books I and II: witness the change in meaning of *Pantagruélisme* as the work progresses. In similar fashion Pulci's humor is most conspicuous, broadest, in the episodes involving Morgante and Margutte, that is, in the first twenty cantos. Both giants had died before the first section of the work was published (Cantos I-XXIII, published at Venice in 1482). The tone changes notably in the last five cantos. Therefore, we need consider the general approach of the two men only in the earlier part of their works.

It is true, as Momigliano points out,<sup>2</sup> that Pulci rarely offers us laughter for the pure sake of laughter. But neither does he start from an ethical base; his is rarely deliberate satire. It is, rather, superficial and subjective, an interruption on the part of the author. From Rabelais' point of view, however, the entire fabric of Pulci's work was trivial: the feats of chivalric heroes have no luster for Maître François' eyes. In fact, he places all the Knights of the Round Table in Hell, performing menial tasks (II, 30); Morgante himself appears as a *brasseur de bière*. The chivalric spirit is for Rabelais little more than a delightful subject for satire. His own work is not merely to entertain: it will instruct. Hence he can permit himself numerous contemporary allusions: to the Sorbonne, to the law courts, to education, to whatever comes to hand. Parody will be normal to him, unusual in Pulci. He can always permit himself to treat humorously, can always laugh at his own exaggerations, can always find place for additional buffoonery. Thus he will launch into a pseudoscientific discussion of eleven-month pregnancies with a fabulous list of authorities testifying to the occurrence of such phenomena, only to veer off at the end:

Moyennans lesquelles loys, les femmes vefves peuvent franchement jouer du serre-crochiere à tous enviz et toutes restes, deux mois après le trespas de leurs mariz (I, 3).

Pulci will offer instead the quiet comment, the barbed dart. Rinaldo is to fight with the virgin warrior Antea, but instead lies a-bed wailing that he is in love with her. Orlando reasons with him in vain:

A Ulivier n'andava e Ricciardetto,  
E disse: il nostro Rinaldo è già armato,  
Ch'aspetta a la battaglia Antea nel letto. (XVI, 57)

Or the delightfully inverted description when a giant hurls a rock at Orlando:

Tanto ch'Orlando bisognò schermisse;  
Che se l'avesse giunto la percossa,  
Non bisognava il medico venisse. (I, 38)

This vein is inexhaustible in Pulci. Examples abound in every canto, while Rabelais but rarely turns to such devices for his humor. A more vigorous, burly type of comedy is better suited to the semi-popular character of his tales. The meeting of Frère Jean and Grandgousier is typical:

Quand il [Frère Jean] feut venu, mille caresses, mille embrassemens, mille bons jours feurent donnez: "Hé! Frere Jean, mon amy, Frere Jean, mon grand cousin, Frere Jean de par le diable, l'acolee, mon amy!—A moy la brassée!—Cza,

<sup>2</sup> Attilio Momigliano, *L'Indole e il riso di Luigi Pulci* (Rocca S. Cassiano: Licinio Capelli, 1907). Cf. esp., p. 120. My debt to Momigliano is great for his excellent classification of comic elements in Pulci and for numerous suggestive comments. The work suffers, however, from the author's *parti pris* of finding humor on all sides.

couillon, que je t'esrend à force de t'acoller." Et Frere Jean de rigoller! Jamais homme ne fut tant courtois ny gracieux (I, 39).

Contrast Pulci's description of the reunion, after many months, of Orlando with Morgante, who represents the comic, burlesque element in the epic. The giant is sighted:

E come al conte Orlando fu più presso,  
Subitamente ginocchione è posto:  
Orlando smonta e'ncontro ne va ad esso,  
E cominciò le braccia aprir discosto:  
Che si conosce un grand'amore espresso,  
E disse: lieva, Morgante, su tosto;  
E misse gli le braccia strette al collo,  
E mille volte et poi mille bacciollo. (XIX, 159)

Pulci cannot normally permit himself the ranting of a Rabelais. Its tone would jar. And when he tries, as in the regret of Morgante for Margutte, he is incapable of it, as all who contrast the lament of Gargantua for Badebec will recognize.

Rabelais comes closest to Pulci in his three giants, all said to be drawn from Morgante and Margutte. Upon this common ground each man is strikingly conditioned by his approach. Rabelais, when treating of their size, goes so far in his exaggerations that it becomes pure buffoonery, whereas Pulci must stay close to reality or can permit himself only a limited exaggeration. Morgante, for instance, manages through tremendous efforts to knock down a tower. The reader struggles with him (XIX, 168 ff.). Note the casual, matter-of-fact tone of a similar feat by Gargantua:

Alors chocqua de son grand arbre contre le chateau, et à grands coups abastit et tours et forteresses, et ruyna tout par terre. Par ce moyen feurent tous rompuz et mis en pieces ceulx qui estoient en icelluy (I, 36).

Each author must make use of his giants in terms of his general framework. Their size amazes all who see them. Rabelais makes this only a point of departure for other comic effects. Pantagruel has reached Paris:

Et, à son entrée, tout le monde sortit hors pour le veoir, comme vous sçavez bien que le peuple de Paris maillotinier est sot par nature, par bequarre, et par bemol, et le regardoyent en grand esbahissement, et non sans grande peur qu'il n'emportast le Palais ailleurs . . . (II, 7).<sup>4</sup>

For Pulci, the size alone must suffice. The good abbot whom Morgante had been attacking,

E risguardava, e squadrava Morgante,  
La sua grandezza e una volta e due. . . (I, 57)

<sup>4</sup> And Rabelais does this, not once, but twice! Gargantua, too, amazes the Parisians: "Quelques jours après qu'ilz se feurent refraichiz, il visita la ville, et fut veu de tout le monde en grande admiration. Car le peuple de Paris est tant sot, tant badaut, et tant inepte de nature, q'un basteleur, un porteur de rogatons, un muilet avecques ses cymbales, un vieilleuz au mylieu d'un carrefour, assemblera plus de gens que ne feroit un bon prescheur evangelique" (I, 17).

Or Emperor Carlo:

Ecco apparir col battaglio Morgante,  
Carlo guardava questo compagno,  
E disse: mai non vidi un tal gigante!  
Ebbe di sua grandezza ammirazione. (X, 12)

Mere size is not hilarious or soon palls. Pulci, therefore, turns—though too infrequently—to the sly comment in which his odd view may give rise to a smile. Margutte, describing himself, says:

Ed ebbi voglia anch'io d'esser gigante;  
Poi mi pentì, quando a mezzo fu'giunto:  
Vedi che sette braccia sono appunto. (XVIII, 133)

But this is not a type of humor which Rabelais can handle easily. His robust temperament is unsuited to it. Here the characters of the men rather than their approaches have differentiated them.

The two authors meet again in the descriptions of battles. For the most part, they are serious matters to Pulci, but there are passages where he uses them for comic relief. Morgante knocks over the tent of Manfredonio and wraps the unfortunate Saracen in it, in company with the Paladin Dodone, to their great discomfiture (VII, 17-19). Or in battle, Morgante piles up so many dead around him that his enemies cannot reach him to inflict further wounds (X, 46-47)! And, in a longer passage, Pulci twice tells us that all who saw the battle were unable to restrain their laughter. The passage merits quotation:

Vegurto prese lui sotto le braccia:  
Or chi vedesse questi due giganti  
Provorsi quivi insieme a faccia a faccia,  
Maravigliato saria ne'sembianti:  
Ma pur Morgante in terra al fin la caccia,  
Tanto che rider facea tutti quanti:  
Che quando e'l'ebbe in su lo smalto a porre,  
Parve che in terra cadesse una torre.  
E nel cader percoteva il Danese  
Tal che'l Danese sotto gli cascava:  
Orlando molto ne rise e'l Marchese. . . .

Or chi vedesse giocar qui a sonaglio,  
Non riterrebbe le risa a sua posta:  
L'un col battaglio, e l'altro con la scure  
S'appiccan pesche che non son mature. (X, 142 ff.)

Pulci's readers are not apt to find this as irresistible as do Orlando and *Il Marchese*.

Rabelais is a far different matter. The mock cause for the war with the *fouaciers de Lerne* (I, 25) is a broad satire of Rabelais' contemporaries. The amazing prodigies of Gymnaste to defeat his opponent (I, 35) are not only exaggerations; they are delightfully absurd. And Rabelais' prolific use of complex medical terms in describing wounds adds a mock-serious tone: the doughty Frère Jean is



armed with his frock, a barbed parody of the enchanted weapons and armor of the epics, as he fights,

... Tyravant, lequell coucha sa lance en l'arrest, et en ferut à toute oultrance le moyne au milieu de la poitrine; mais, rencontrant le froc horrifique, rebouscha par le fer, comme si vous frappiez d'une petite bougie contre une enclume. Adoncq le moyne, avec son baston de croix luy donna entre col et collet sus l'os acromion, si rudement qu'il l'estonna, et feist perdre tout sens et mouvement, et tomba es piedz du cheval (I, 43).

In another passage, Rabelais describes a rout, using images and terms which Pulci's approach and aims forbade:

Et,—comme vous voyez un asne, quand il a au cul un œstre Junonique, ou une mouche qui le point, courir ça et là sans voye ny chemin, gettant sa charge par terre, rompant son frain et renes, sans aucunement respirer ni prendre repos, et ne sçayt on qui le meut, car l'on ne veoit rien qui le touche,—ainsi fuyoient ces gens de sens desproveuz, sans sçavoir cause de fuyr; tant seulement les pour-suit une terreur panice, laquelle avoient conceue en leurs ames (I, 44).

Rabelais' humor can have full play where Pulci could at best suggest his half-smile.

Both Rabelais and Pulci show vicious characters in a humorous light. Margutte, the incarnation of seventy-seven mortal sins, is usually compared with Panurge. But Margutte may be matched, at least in food and drink, with Frère Jean. And both are challenged for their vices. The difference in their reactions illustrates the restraints under which Pulci worked, restraints unknown to Rabelais, who can give full rein to his love of laughter. Margutte, unmercifully berated by Morgante for his misbehavior, answers that he warned Morgante about it on their first meeting. Hence, his companion has no grounds for complaint:

Io credeva, Morgante, qu'il sapessi  
Ch'io abbi tutti i peccati mortali:  
Il primo di, perchè mi conoscessi,  
Tel dissi pure a letter di speciali:  
Puomi tu altro appor ch'io ti dicessi?  
Questi son peccatuzzi veniali:  
Lascia ch'io vegga da fare un bel tratto  
In qualche modo, e chiarirotti affato.  
Morgante finalmente convenia  
Che in riso e in gioco s'arrechì ogni cosa,  
E vanno seguitando la lor via. . . (XIX, 143-44)<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Pulci actually treats this theme twice. The passage cited is but a repetition of an argument stated fifty cantos earlier. Twice Pulci has drawn back from the bolder position which Rabelais' approach will permit. After being severely reproved,

Disse Margutte: hai tu per cosa nuova,  
Ch'io sia cattivo con tutti peccati,  
Al fuoco, al paragone, a tutta prova  
Un oro più fino di carati?  
Io non fu' appena uscito fuor de l'uova,  
Ch'io ero il caffo de gli sciagurati,  
Anzi la schiuma di tutti ribaldi,  
E tu credevi io tenessi i piè saldi? (XIX, 99)



Rabelais, in contrast, has no reason to apologize for vice; rather, by a bold insistence, he can heighten the comic effect. Frère Jean, bursting in upon his fellow monks to warn them of the attack upon the abbey, has a lively exchange of words with the prior, indicative of Rabelais' greater freedom:

Lors dist le prieur claustral: "Que fera cest ivrogne icy? Qu'on me le mene en prison. Troubler ainsi le service divin!—Mais, dist le moyne, le service du vin, faisons tant qu'il ne soit troublé, car vous mesmes, Monsieur le Prieur, ayez boyre du meilleur. Si fait tout homme de bien; jamais homme noble ne hayst le bon vin; c'est un apophthegme monachal" (I, 27).

Indeed, it is only in the vice of gluttony that we find the two men together. For here Pulci felt free to abandon the tone of the epic. His "half-serious rhyme" is less in evidence as he leaps upon this terrain, his full-throated laugh foreshadowing that of Rabelais.

Obscenity, which bulks so large in Rabelais, is relatively absent from Pulci, a further illustration of the fundamental difference in approach of the two men. Bawdy elements can have but small space in an epic on the heroic plane, while to Rabelais they will come naturally. Margutte does once or twice break the bonds which Pulci imposes:

Margutte quando udi questa novella,  
Diceva: io voglio andar per qualche ingoffo;  
E tolse uno schidione e la padella;  
Tinsesi il viso e fecesi ben goffo  
E corre ove sedeva la donzella,  
E fece de lo'mpronto e del gaglioffo,  
E disse: il cuoco anco lui vuol la mancia.  
O io ti tignerò tutta la guancia. (XIX, 136)

But Morgante severely calls him a disgrace. On the contrary, Rabelais' tale, like a great wave, will surge forward adding obscenity to obscenity with a tumbling mass of surf, all too often degenerating into scum. The approach to the comic has set—or removed!—the bounds.

Huge horses figure in both stories. Rabelais derives his comic effects from types of exaggeration current in folklore. Pulci, perforce, refrains from this approach. He does give Morgante a horse which dies under him:

Morgante in su'n prato il caval mena,  
E vuol che corra, e che facci ogni pruova,  
A pensa che di ferro abbi la schiena,  
O forse non credeva schiacciare l'uova:  
Questo caval s'accoscia per la pena,  
E scoppia, e'n su la terra si ritruova.  
Dicea Morgante: lieva su, rozzone;  
E va pur punzecchiando con lo sprone.  
Ma finalmente convien ch'egli smonte,  
E disse: io son pur legghier come penna,  
Ed è scoppiato; che ne di'tu, conte?  
Rispose Orlando: un arbore d'antenna  
Mi par piuttosto, e la gaggia la fronte. . . . (I, 68-69)

But Pulci cannot sustain the humor within his prescribed limits. Rabelais, with full license to turn to the farce, will clothe the matter in his fabulous vocabulary and exaggerate it to the point of wild, ludicrous absurdity. Gargantua is riding his mare through a great forest infested with hornets:

Car soudain qu'ilz feurent entrez en la dicte forest et que les freslons luy eurent livré l'assault, elle desguaina sa queue et si bien s'escarmouchant les esmoucha, qu'elle en abatit tout le boys. A tord, à travers, deçà, delà, par cy, par là, de long, de large, dessus, dessous, abatoit boys comme un fauscheur faict d'herbes, en sorte que depuis n'y eut ne boys ne freslons, mais feut tout le pays reduict en campagne (I, 16).

In the apt use of quotations to provoke a laugh, it is the subtler Pulci who will be the more effective, for here his approach gives free rein to his genius. Lines from Dante occur in almost every canto, few however more superbly ironic than a comment of Morgante to Margutte, praising him for his culinary knowledge. Recalling the Danteque praise of Aristotle, Morgante says to his companion:

Tu se'il maestro di color che sanno. . . (XVIII, 199)

Rabelais, on a grosser level, will often be learned, will often be clever. But he failed to learn from Pulci the art of the "half-serious rhyme." It is amusing when Rabelais reverses the proverb, *non de ponte vadit qui cum sapientia cadit* (II, 11). But this is not of the same caliber. Rabelais' heavy-footed wit stumbles in the tracks of Pulci.

Rabelais, playing with words, is much more apt to turn to his own forte, the outburst of a torrent of words hurtling down upon the reader, leaving him gasping and breathless, but usually laughing: Janotus de Bragmardo, *Les Propos des beuveurs* (I, 5), the Discourse of Frère Jean at dinner (I, 39). The Italian, to be sure, is not above hurling insults, making puns, or using strong language. The giant, Sperante, turns upon Morgante, who has called himself a knight errant,

E disse: gaglioffaccio pien di broda,  
Tu sarai ben, come dicesti, errante,  
Se tu credi acquistar qua fama o loda. (XIX, 38)

But the epic does not lend itself to the qualities of Rabelais' exuberant prose.

Both men find it amusing to discuss their sources at great length. Pulci, forced to stay within the bounds of reason, is unable to sustain the matter throughout the space he allots to it. He takes three *ottave* (XIX, 152-54) to discuss a problem about the death of Margutte as the different sources give it. Our interest has languished well before the end. Rabelais, discussing the sources for *Gargantua* (I, 1), for ten lines piles absurdity upon absurdity; and his vein is not exhausted as he draws to his close, for he notes at the very end the finding of a volume, long buried, and "plus mais non mieulx sentant que roses."

A less restricting approach has heightened the comic effect in Rabelais' discussion of sources; but his temperament renders him inferior to Pulci in the portrayal of love. He and Pulci both tried their hands at it. Rabelais, writing during one of the recurrent crises of antifeminism, has innumerable violent satires of women and love. But nowhere does he attempt the charming and witty sallies so abundant in Pulci. It is enough to cite one or two passages from the *Morgante* to make clear that Rabelais could not have adapted his buffoonery to this more subtle wit. Rinaldo, who has been the lover of Luciana, is now enkindled by Antea and asks Olivieri to give her every honor:

Disse Olivier: così va la fortuna:  
Cercati d'altro amante, Luciana. . . (XVI, 23)

There is a lightness of touch here which Rabelais could never have approximated, for he had no talent to be sharpened by the example of the Italian master. Again, how delightfully Pulci carries through his image in describing the suicide of Forisena on the departure of Olivieri:

La qual veggendo partire Olivieri,  
Avea più volte con seco disposto  
Di seguirlo, e fatti stran pensieri,  
Nè potè più il suo amor tener nascosto;  
E la condusse quel bendato arcieri,  
Per veder quando Olivier può discosto  
A un balcone; e l'arco poi diserra,  
Tanto che questa si gittava a terra. (V, 17)

Pulci, "the sire of the half-serious rhyme," has used a type of wit and humor ideally suited to his own chosen genre, while Rabelais has written a burlesque, a parody, a humorous work with a meaning hidden beneath. Each man, conditioned by his approach, has viewed his comic material from his own vantage point and has handled it, within those confines, in the terms suggested by his own temperament.<sup>6</sup>

Pomona College

<sup>6</sup> The study of Rabelais' debt to Pulci should be framed in these terms. So stated, Panurge apart, the debt is unimportant or irrelevant.

## VALERA'S PHILOSOPHICAL ARGUMENTS AGAINST NATURALISM

By MANUEL OLGUÍN

Although several excellent studies have been devoted to Valera's criticism in this country and abroad,<sup>1</sup> an important point in his criticism still needs to be emphasized because of the interest that it may have for students of comparative literature or aesthetics as a clear case of the influence of philosophy or theology upon literary criticism. This is the case of Valera's attack on Zola's naturalism, using three arguments which are exactly the same as those which theologians and philosophers of idealism, defenders of the thesis of man's freedom, have traditionally used against determinists.

As everyone knows, the controversy of free-will versus determinism is almost as old as philosophy itself. Already active in the writings of Greek philosophers, it flares up all through the Middle Ages in the very bosom of the Church, and after the Renaissance with its scientific and philosophic achievements, it reaches the proportions of a European conflagration among philosophers and theologians. After the eighteenth century, the violence recedes, but the controversy is still alive at the beginning of our century in the writings of some idealists; and at the present moment, the stress that Existentialism puts on human freedom may again stir the fire under the ashes.

One may thus consider the controversy of free-will and determinism a permanent philosophical issue and explain its vitality by the religious or moral implications ascribed to it by the adversaries of determinism. Since the Middle Ages the latter have combatted determinism on the ground that it is a fatalistic conception of human destiny, with no place for moral responsibility, desert, or divine justice, and have invoked the testimony of a moral conscience as the decisive proof of man's freedom. After the Renaissance the attempt of mechanistic philosophy to explain psychological processes, hence volition, in terms of necessary causal relations, was fiercely combatted by libertarians as a denial of the spirituality of the soul, the confusion of this "substance" with matter or conversion of man into a machine compelled to act by an external force.

We may thus stress that the arguments waged by libertarians against determinists during centuries may be reduced to these three: the argument of fatalism, the argument of the irreducibility of the spiritual substance to matter or against man's conversion into a machine, and

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Sherman A. Eoff, "The Spanish Novel of Ideas," *PMLA*, LV (June, 1940), 531-58. Edith Fishine, *Don Juan Valera, the Critic* (Bryn Mawr, 1933). Gerhard Engel, *Don Juan Valera, Weltanschauung und Denkverfahren* (Berlin, 1935).

the argument of the testimony of a moral conscience as the spirituality and freedom of the soul.

The following passages are representative examples of the use of these arguments. The first belongs to Clarke, the famous opponent of Leibnitz, and clearly illustrates the use of the arguments of fatalism and man's conversion into a machine. The second, advanced by Mansel, the antagonist of Stuart Mill, stresses the arguments of fatalism and the testimony of the moral conscience:

To suppose that all motions of our bodies are necessary and caused by mechanical impulses of *Matter*, altogether independent from the soul; is what (I cannot but think) tends to introduce Necessity and Fate. It tends to make *Men* thought of as mere *Machines*.<sup>2</sup>

Are our volitions like other events, the result of causes? Certainly not; in the only intelligible sense of the term, I have only two positive notions of causation: one of exertion of power by an intelligent being; the other, the uniform sequence of B from A. *The former hypothesis is fatalism. If my will results from coercion of some other intelligence*, I am the slave of Destiny. The latter hypothesis is Determinism, a necessity no less than fatalism, *besides being at variance with the whole testimony of consciousness and with the experience of every day*.<sup>3</sup>

If we now consider the arguments that Valera used against Zola's naturalism, we find that they fall into two groups. One group is strictly aesthetic in character and derived from Valera's own conception of art. This group, well studied by his critics, can be briefly summarized as a rejection of the naturalistic attempt to indoctrinate the reader, to apply the experimental method to the novel, and to transform literature into a detailed document of reality. Valera's attack against this aesthetic program stems, as has been shown by his students, from his adherence to the doctrine of art for art's sake which prohibits the confusion of art with science or indoctrination and stresses the function of idealization in the creative process as opposed to servile copy of reality, especially when, for purposes of indoctrination, this reality is consistently depicted in its most somber aspects.

The second group is formed by philosophical arguments which strictly coincide with those traditionally used by theologians and philosophers, partisans of free-will as illustrated above with excerpts from Clarke and Mansel. These are: the argument of fatalism, the argument of the irreducibility of the spiritual substance to matter or argument against man's conversion into a machine, and the argument of the testimony of the moral conscience. I select a few representative examples from Valera of each argument to be compared with the above examples of Clarke and Mansel.

Arguments of fatalism and the irreducibility of the spiritual substance to matter:

<sup>2</sup> Samuel Clarke, *Collected Papers* (London, 1717), p. 325.

<sup>3</sup> Henry L. Mansel, *Prolegomena Logica* (London, 1851), p. 298. Italics mine.

Existe en el día decidida inclinación a hacer en las obras literarias estudios y análisis del alma humana, profundizando mucho, sin miedo a que se aflija al lector o al oyente y pase un mal rato en vez de deleitarse. El referido análisis o estudio, desapiado y hondo, se funda en una psicología fisiológica, donde lo espiritual y lo material aparecen combinados y tal vez indistintos y donde la pasión nace casi siempre de un determinismo preestablecido, cuyos gérmenes y raíces son el temperamento y otras condiciones orgánicas que se adquieren por la herencia, aunque no se hereden, y que el medio ambiente y otras exteriores circunstancias desarrollan luego en cada individuo. Hay, pues, en todo algo de fatal e ineluctable, como la caída de los cuerpos graves hacia el centro, como el curso de los ríos hacia la mar y como el eterno giro de los planetas en el cielo.<sup>4</sup>

Even the metaphor of man's conversion into a machine used by the idealists, defenders of free-will as illustrated by Clarke's passage, is used by Valera to stress his argument of the spirituality of the soul:

Véase la definición que da Pablo Alexis en su libro *Emilio Zolá*. "El hombre es fatalmente el producto de un temperamento particular, hereditario, que se desarrolla en cierto medio físico, intelectual y moral, el cual se modifica por diversas circunstancias históricas." En suma, *el hombre es una máquina que hace por fuerza* lo que su propia constitución y el impulso exterior le prescriben.<sup>5</sup>

Argument of the testimony of the moral conscience:

Quiero dar por indiscutible que el concepto pesimista que Zolá y los de su escuela se forjan del mundo y de cuantos seres corpóreos y vivos el mundo encierra, no es más espantoso que el que se forjan los cristianos; pero en éstos cuando no se salen de la ortodoxia, persiste la creencia en el libre albedrío del hombre, el cual ayudado de la gracia puede triunfar de toda tentación, a pesar de la decadencia que el pecado original trajo consigo. Mundo pecado y carne, no valen contra el hombre, contando con el auxilio del cielo, y aun negar o afirmar lo necesario de este auxilio importa poco para el caso. Aquí no tratamos de teología moral sino de estética. Lo que importa asegurar es que todo hombre es responsable de sus faltas, porque sobrenatural o naturalmente se siente capaz de domar sus apetitos y pasiones, y no es juguete de fuerza ciega e irresistible. Aunque seamos escépticos hasta al extremo de negar toda revelación y toda ley divina positivas; aunque nos declaremos autónomos, sacudiendo el yugo de toda autoridad, de la Iglesia, del Estado, de los sacerdotes y de los legisladores, *siempre queda en lo íntimo de nuestro espíritu una ley que obedecemos y de que tenemos conciencia de obedecer, como seres libres*.<sup>6</sup>

En lo que yo no consiento, no ya la negación pero ni la duda, es en que soy libre, en que soy responsable, *en que llevo la ley moral grabada en mi alma*, y que la raíz, origen y fundamento de esta ley y de esta alma, es un bien absoluto, infinito, eterno. . . .<sup>7</sup>

It would thus seem in the presence of these passages that there can be no doubt that Valera's philosophical or theological arguments against naturalism are exactly the same as those which idealists and theologians have traditionally waged against the endeavors of mecha-

<sup>4</sup> "La duda," *Obras completas*, XXIX (Madrid, 1905-1922), 258-59. Italics mine.

<sup>5</sup> "Apuntes sobre el nuevo arte de escribir novelas," *Obras completas*, XXVI, 55-56. Italics mine.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, XXVI, 85-86. Italics mine.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, XXVI, 93. Italics mine.

nistic philosophy to extend the necessary causality of nature to mental processes. This coincidence is explained by the fact that, for Valera, Zola's naturalism is the direct outcome of Positivism, a philosophical school to which Valera ascribes the same materialistic and fatalistic outlook of the universe that the idealist partisans of free-will traditionally attribute to mechanism:

El naturalismo, además, no es mero capricho. Tiene su razón de ser. Nace de un modo dialéctico, inevitable de la negación de toda ciencia especulativa, del positivismo.<sup>8</sup>

Ahora la filosofía experimental, esto es la negación de la religión y de la metafísica, ha quitado a muchos las esperanzas ultramundanas. La única filosofía especulativa que ha quedado es pesimista, es una a modo de budhismo. . . .<sup>9</sup>

Valera's use of the traditional arguments of the libertarians raises a philosophical question. Supposing that Valera was right in his characterization of naturalism as a fatalistic, materialistic conception of the world which makes void the notion of moral responsibility, desert, and divine justice, was he right in affirming that naturalism derives these characteristics from the philosophy of Positivism? Apart from the fact that sound studies of French naturalism clearly prove that Zola derives as much optimism as pessimism from his determinist conception of the world,<sup>10</sup> Valera's view on Positivism as a fatalistic and materialistic philosophy is based on the ground that this philosophy propounds a conception of man and the universe strictly ruled by necessary causes. This view is incorrect in so far as it is based on a misapprehension of the notion of necessary causality introduced by theologians and idealist philosophers, enemies of the philosophy of mechanism: the confusion of the notion of necessary causality with that of compulsion or constraint. We can thus see that "exertion of power," "mechanical impulses of matter," are the terms by which Clarke and Mansel translate the notion of causation, and similarly that Valera conceives of man submitted to determinism as "*una máquina que hace por fuerza lo que su propia constitución y el impulso exterior le prescriben.*"

Hume<sup>11</sup> was the first to call attention to this misapprehension on which the controversy is grounded, stressing the fact that the necessary determination sought by the mechanistic philosophy, whether in mind or nature, does not mean compulsion or constraint. It simply means that one has found by experience a constant connection between an event and its antecedent, and that the habit of seeing this connection repeated without exception makes one expect that it will not fail in

<sup>8</sup> *Obras completas*, XXVI, 25-26.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, XXVI, 68; cf. also "Morruña," XXVIII, 17-18.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. P. Martino, *Le Naturalisme français* (Paris, 1945), p. 97 f.

<sup>11</sup> D. Hume, *Treatise* (Oxford, 1928), Bk. I, Sec. XIV; Bk. II, Sec. I, II. J. Stuart Mill, *An Examination of Sir Hamilton's Philosophy* (New York, 1877), II, Chap. XXVI; and *Logic* (London, 1872), II, Bk. VI, Chap. II.



the future. But since the only evidences the determinist has for expecting regularity in causal sequence is past experience and nothing guarantees that the future may not contradict this experience, the most adequate term to describe the causal relation is not *necessity* but *probability*. Thus deprived of the element of compulsion attributed to causality by idealists and theologians, this notion not only does not contradict but becomes indispensable to the very notion of freedom. For this is a moral notion implying that man is responsible for his actions, and responsibility is in turn a notion based on the relation of cause and effect, as it is plain in the fact that a responsible man is one who *causes* his own action or one who receives the reward or pain for actions he has caused.

If, therefore, it is true, as Valera affirmed, that naturalism denied the freedom of the will and in so doing set up a fatalistic conception of the world from which responsibility and spiritual values are excluded, it is so not *because* but *in spite of* its alleged connections with Positivism or other forms of mechanistic philosophy.

*University of California, Los Angeles*

## NERON AND NARCISSE: A DUALITY RESOLVED

By FRANK W. LINDSAY

When Jean Racine, in his tragedy *Britannicus*, made Narcisse the confidant of Néron, he resurrected a dead man to play a role for which his historical qualifications were narrowly limited. Tacitus tells us that Narcissus was in prison when Nero acceded, and committed suicide there in the early days of the reign.<sup>1</sup> We search the *Annals* in vain for evidence that Narcissus was ever friendly with Nero; the only passage in the work where Tacitus suggests a possible affinity between the two is his casual mention of Nero's annoyance at the freedman's death: "... Narcissus ... ad mortem agitur, invito principe, cujus abditis adhuc vitiis per avaritiam ac prodigientiam mire congruebat."<sup>2</sup>

Racine used part of this passage in defense of his choice of Narcissus as confidant in his 1676 preface: "Je lui donne Narcisse pour confident. J'ai suivi en cela Tacite, qui dit que . . . cet affranchi avoit une conformité merveilleuse avec les vices du prince encore cachés: *cujus abditis adhuc vitiis mire congruebat*." Even in the few words that he quoted from the historian, Racine apparently felt constrained to do a little editing, for he deleted "per avaritiam ac prodigientiam." Why he should have done so becomes obvious when we recall that these vices, in the seventeenth-century view, were comic, not tragic ones.<sup>3</sup> Besides, avarice and prodigality would have appeared irrelevant in a tragedy whose theme is lust and monstrosity.

Thus, Racine appears to have tried to cancel out Narcisse's general unfitness as Néron's confidant by means of "mire congruebat" alone. Presumably, the purpose behind the attempt is revealed through a stylistic interpretation of the relationship between Néron and Narcisse.

This interpretation has its roots in the character of Néron. There is evidence in the preface of 1676 that Racine recognized a knotty artistic problem in the projection of the complex personality of the man who was to be the central figure in his tragedy:

Pour commencer par Néron . . . il ne m'a pas été permis de le représenter aussi méchant qu'il a été depuis. Je ne le représente pas non plus comme un homme vertueux; car il ne l'a jamais été . . . c'est ici un monstre naissant, mais qui n'ose encore se déclarer, et qui cherche des couleurs à ses méchantes actions. . . .

In other words, Racine realized that in order to achieve his optimum artistic effect, he had to fuse both parts of the duality propounded

<sup>1</sup> *Annals*, XIII, 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Idem*.

<sup>3</sup> Molière's *L'Avare* (September 9, 1668) had appeared on the stage a little more than a year before *Britannicus*. The vice of prodigality had its comic epitome in Regnard's *Le Joueur* (1696).

above, giving to each its full dramatic value, while at the same time unequivocally showing the emergence of Néron's ultimate monstrosity. Since he clearly had no time, within the framework of the play, for a leisurely development of the emperor's character, how was he to encompass and make convincing in Néron the change from "trois ans de vertus" (line 462)<sup>4</sup> to the settled career of bestiality which was soon to distinguish his reign? I wish to suggest that he could not have done so without Narcisse; for the text of *Britannicus* furnishes a number of indications which lead to an interpretation of Narcisse as the extension of Néron's personality, his alter ego.

Act I presents Néron only through the eyes of Burrhus and Agrippine, and, to some extent, of Albine also. The complexity of his character is announced, and the resolution is foreshadowed; but the key to his personality, held by Narcisse, remains hidden. His virtuous side is expressed first by Albine, who calls him "un empereur parfait," who "gouverne en père" (26, 29), and later by Burrhus, who sees in him the epitome of "la vertu" (203). Agrippine, on the other hand, herself a monstrous woman, penetrates her son's virtuous surface, and recognizes his rising monstrosity ("Il se déguise en vain. Je lis sur son visage / Des fiers Domitius l'humeur triste et sauvage," 35-36). With her own monstrous act—the murder of Claudius—fresh in her memory, she knows that a monster, once unleashed, brooks no constraint ("Néron m'échappera, si ce frein ne l'arrête," 72). The ugly fact which broods over the whole of Act I, the abduction of Junie, leads Agrippine and Burrhus to an intense tug-of-war over the soul of Néron (Scene 2), but in the end each is left in the same state of uneasy conjecture in which he entered the contest. Agrippine is still seeking the reason for her son's act, and Burrhus, in spite of his specious face-saving defense of the abduction, is groping no less than she for its true explanation, for he places himself among "ceux que l'Empereur a consultés le moins" (286).

It is no accident that Narcisse makes his entrance directly after this speech, for it was presumably he alone whom Néron did consult, as is implied in his first speech to Néron: "Grâces aux dieux, Seigneur, Junie entre vos mains/ Vous assure aujourd'hui du reste des Romains" (373-74).

The central theme of the play is clearly whether Burrhus or Agrippine will bring the "monstre naissant" to heel, or whether Néron, following his bent, will emerge as the "monstre parfait." Narcisse is beyond question the deciding factor in this struggle. As a separate character—confidant, evil counselor, informer—he must, of course, remain secondary; but as Néron's double, he is indispensable to the presentation of Néron's character.

For Racine, Néron's monstrosity was matched by that of Narcisse—matched, but not necessarily complemented; for two monsters placed

<sup>4</sup> References are to the Mesnard edition.

in juxtaposition are more likely to find themselves in conflict than in harmony, e.g., Néron and Agrippine. Hence, in order to achieve the harmony necessary to his psychological and artistic pattern, Racine had to push Tacitus' "mire congruebat" to its furthest limit—identity of motive—thus obviating the possibility of conflict. The completeness with which Racine achieved this end becomes evident when we attempt to ascribe to Narcisse any willed actions which are not also Néron's. The core of Racinian tragedy is found in the concept of an initial act involving the total personality of all the characters. This act causes desire and the exercise of the will, which inevitably lead to a second act, and the cycle begins all over again, repeating itself until finally each character suffers destruction or disintegration as a result of the act. Now desire and will in Racinian tragedy are practically synonymous, and, by Racinian definition, they stand for motive, for a Racinian character is motivated by what he wants, and by that alone.

Néron is driven to the acts which will make him a monster by desires which he cannot and need not explain; he is motivated only by his instinct toward monstrosity. This instinct, however, has hitherto been repressed through the influence and vigilance of two people who themselves have intense desires: Burrhus, who desires a just and benevolent imperial government, and Agrippine, who desires power. Into this situation comes another, an older and more experienced man than Néron, who shares Néron's desire for evil: Narcisse. Not only does he desire the same things as Néron; he is also able to suggest to his master the means of overcoming the obstacles that the emperor finds in his path toward monstrosity. In their first scene together, Néron succinctly outlines these obstacles: "Octavie, Agrippine, Burrhus, / Sénèque, Rome entière, et trois ans de vertus" (461-62). But Narcisse cynically minimizes them and shows Néron the means by which they can be overcome. Octavie can be repudiated by divorce (474-75); Agrippine's power is a specter that can be laid by steadfast resistance (492-94); as for Burrhus, "Son adroite vertu ménage son crédit" (1462); and "Rome entière" is a capricious guide for an emperor's conduct, and can be more readily counted upon to applaud a tyrant than to revere a saint (1432-54).

The Abbé Nadal was, to my knowledge, the first to broach a critical suggestion of the Néron-Narcisse identity:

Quel art n'y a-t-il point surtout dans le Rolle de Narcisse, et particulièrement dans la dernière Scène du quatrième Acte . . . ? Sa perfidie plus adroite que la vertu de Burrhus suit de proche en proche tous les mouvemens du coeur de Néron. . . .<sup>5</sup>

The latter remark receives interesting stylistic support from four of the eight occurrences<sup>6</sup> of the verb "affranchir" (including its past participle as substantive) in the play. The use of "affranchir" in these

<sup>5</sup> Nadal, *Œuvres Mêlées* (Paris, 1738), II, 254.

<sup>6</sup> The occurrence of "affranchir" not cited in the text is found in line 1126.

four instances seems to prove that Racine was not averse to making a pun when it served his purpose. Néron's final emancipation from the influences which would block his monstrosity is foreshadowed in the lines:

Et c'est pour m'*affranchir*<sup>7</sup> de cette dépendance (507)

Cette férocité, que tu croyois fléchir,  
De tes faibles liens est prête à s'*affranchir* (801-02)

On *affranchit* Néron de la foi conjugale (816)

Tu voudras t'*affranchir* du joug de mes bienfaits (1678)

As these lines tick off the waning ascendancy over Néron of Octavie, Agrippine, and Burrhus, they also show, by means of the pun on "affranchir-affranchi," the progressive "freedmanization" of the emperor; and "freedmanization" we may here consider as synonymous with "Narcissification," especially when we recall that Racine prepared the equation in Act I with the lines:

Rome, à trois *affranchis*<sup>8</sup> si longtemps asservie (200)

Seul de ses *affranchis* tu m'es toujours fidèle (344)

Chez Pallas, comme toi l'*affranchi* de mon père (356)

Whereas Narcisse is identical with Néron as to motives, i.e., desires, he is shown as antithetical to the emperor on many points. Where Néron is young and romantic, Narcisse is mature and cynical; where Néron is timid and vacillating, Narcisse is bold; and where Néron is impetuous, Narcisse is suave and sly. Yet however antithetical these attributes may seem on the surface, they combine and complement each other in such a way as to form in the two persons a complete portrait of the figure that Racine had in mind in his remarks about Néron (*supra*, p. 169) in the 1676 preface. Even more succinctly, in the preface of 1670, Racine wrote "s'il a été quelque temps un bon empereur, il a toujours été un très méchant homme." Here the dichotomy is baldly expressed. It remained for Racine to merge and resolve it in the persons of Néron, ostensibly the "bon empereur," and Narcisse, the "très méchant homme." The manner in which he stylistically suggested Néron's gradual assimilation of the evil nature of his freedman, and in which Narcisse, at the completion of the process, is shown to become superfluous, is the chief concern of this study.

It is not amiss to remind ourselves of a condition essential to a critical discussion of the birth of the monster in Néron. Racine gives definite expression to this condition in the 1676 preface: "Il n'a pas encore tué sa mère, sa femme, ses gouverneurs; mais il a en lui les

<sup>7</sup> Italics in this and subsequent quoted matter are mine.

<sup>8</sup> Pallas, Callistus, and Narcissus, the freedmen of Claudius.

semences de tous ces crimes." In other words, the monster is there from the beginning, but given the essentially weak character of the still immature emperor, it cannot be born by itself. The abortive forces are too numerous and too strong: Agrippine, Burrhus, "Rome entière, et trois ans de vertus." There must be a sympathetic and expert midwife to attend this birth—a midwife supplied in the person of Narcisse. Except for him, Burrhus would have conquered the monster, at least for a time, in Act IV, Scene 3. Narcisse prevents this victory in the following scene, and the monster is born. Yet from all points of view—historical, psychological, and artistic—the monster must be Néron's, not Narcisse's: when Narcisse is withdrawn from the scene, the monster Néron must remain self-sufficient and unequivocal. Racine has burned his bridges: Néron carries in himself, and has carried from the beginning, "the seeds of all his crimes"; and from the moment that we know that they will continue to flourish, any trace of the intermediary through which their growth was projected remains as an artistic imperfection. Néron's monstrous integrity is the central theme of the tragedy, and it emerges complete only when the psychological rapprochement of Néron and Narcisse is also completed.

This rapprochement is, in the main, effected stylistically. The first line that Néron speaks to Narcisse in private, the line which announces the theme of the play,

Narcisse, c'en est fait; Néron est amoureux (382)

offers the first of numerous recurrent examples of the close coupling of the Néron-concept with the Narcisse-concept by means of the juxtaposition of names, epithets, or pronouns, always in connection with either the murder of Britannicus or with Néron's lust for Junie.<sup>9</sup> The increased frequency of these juxtapositions from Act IV, Scene 4, to the end of the play serves to indicate the importance that Racine attached to Narcisse as a means of underlining Néron's monstrosity.

The antithetical natures of the two men, as well as the identity of their desires, is at once suggested at their first meeting on the stage. Néron's "c'en est fait" is ambiguous. For him, falling in love with Junie has been an unforeseen and disturbing experience. He is "inquiet," "étonné," "consterné," for he realizes what forces are set against the consummation of his lust, and he is inclined to submit to them. But the "c'en est fait" seen from Narcisse's point of view foreshadows the hideous result of that lust. For Narcisse, Néron's infatuation represents an opportunity for furthering the emperor's tendency toward criminality. The astonishment and rising excitement implicit in the "Vous?" and its echoing "vous l'aimez?" (383, 385), which are all that Narcisse can offer as rejoinder to Néron's announcement, will

<sup>9</sup> See lines 444-45, 742-43, 759-60, 816, 900-01, 1397, 1400, 1405-06, 1412-13, 1423, 1455, 1480, 1532, 1622, 1628, 1639-41, 1658, 1678, 1694, 1696-98, and 1747-48. Since many of these lines are quoted in the text of the article, I consider it unnecessary to labor their significance by quoting them all.

have already subsided during Néron's recital of the abduction, and are crystallized into plan and action with Narcisse's speech in lines 446-58. At the outset, then, we see Néron as a timid and un-self-assured monster, sunk in romantic despondency, while Narcisse is represented as a man of unbounded guile and energy, exerting all his influence to bring about through Néron a result which the emperor desires no less than he.

The two capital scenes between Néron and Narcisse—Act II, Scene 2, and Act IV, Scene 4—are both based on the paradox of antithesis of personality versus identity of motive. In both scenes, Néron is shown on the point of departing from his inherent monstrosity, and in both scenes Narcisse, in speeches whose terms are strikingly similar, sets him back on his path by reminding him that his evil desires are indeed his own.<sup>10</sup> In the earlier scene: "*Vous seul, jusques ici contraire à vos désirs, / N'osez par un divorce assurer vos plaisirs*" (481-82); and in the later: "*De vos propres désirs perdez-vous la mémoire? / Et serez-vous le seul que vous n'oserez croire?*" (1435-36).

There is, however, an important difference in tone between the two scenes. In the earlier one, the antithesis is uppermost, and Néron and Narcisse appear as separate personalities, whereas in the later, the antithetical elements are played down, and the identity of the two emerges almost complete. In Act II, Scene 2, Néron asks Narcisse's opinion, then dares to oppose it; but in Act IV, Scene 4, the emperor appeals to his freedman for a principle to follow, in terms which suggest that he tends to confuse his own personality with that of Narcisse:

Mais, Narcisse, dis-moi, que veux-tu que je fasse?  
Je n'ai que trop de pente à punir son audace;  
Et, si je m'en croyois,<sup>11</sup> ce triomphe indiscret  
Seroit bientôt suivi d'un éternel regret. (1423-26)

Nowhere in the play are the forces for good at work on Néron more strongly posited than in this scene, and nowhere do they stand less chance of succeeding. Evil is now definitely in ascendancy—the evil of Néron's "propres désirs," personified in Narcisse. This personification is further indicated stylistically in the use of the word "maxime" (principle) to supplant "conseil," which is used several times in the earlier parts of the play, especially in "J'ignore quel conseil prépara ma disgrâce" (Agrippine, 104) and "J'écoute vos conseils, j'ose les approuver" (Néron, 497). But as the adversaries of Narcisse come belatedly to recognize him as the power behind the monster, we read "Mais si de vos flatteurs vous suivez la maxime" (Burrhus, 1343) and "[Voyons . . .] S'il voudra désormais suivre d'autres maximes" (Agrippine, 1767).

<sup>10</sup> This, it seems to me, is the key to the paradox. Néron's total monstrosity is historically and artistically inevitable, yet Narcisse is needed to render the inevitability artistically plausible.

<sup>11</sup> Néron puts it this way in spite of the fact that it is Narcisse who has just pointed out the danger of Agrippine's triumph (1417-22).



The identity of Néron and Narcisse is expressed throughout the play by means of an elaborate metaphor. Racine suggests early in Act I that Néron has never been without a directing influence, an alter ego incarnate in a personality stronger than his own. Néron is the body; the soul is someone else. In the beginning, it was Agrippine ("J'étois de ce grand corps"<sup>12</sup> l'âme toute-puissante," 96). She realizes that her hold over him is visibly weakening: "Je vois mes honneurs croître, et tomber mon crédit" (90); and although she does not yet know who is supplanting her as Néron's soul ("J'ignore quel conseil . . ."), she intuitively lays his defection to the emergence of his overweening vanity: "Ce jour, ce triste jour, frappe encor ma mémoire, / Où Néron fut lui-même ébloui de sa gloire" (99-100).

The dazzling of Néron by his own glory is explicitly set forth in Narcisse's flattering speech in lines 446-58, where glittering light and sight are suggested by the words *larmes*, *yeux*, *regardant*, *éclat*, *brillez*, *verront*, *diadème*, *regard*, *verra*, and *gloire*. Such flattery as Narcisse repeatedly pours on Néron (whose nature is rooted in vanity), taken together with this profusion of light- and sight-images, strongly suggests a mirror. And if we were asked to assign a symbol to the name Narcisse, we should certainly offer a mirror. Numerous devices throughout the play, in addition to those already discussed, project the part played by Narcisse in the duality of Néron; from them the mirror symbol emerges as an important aspect of the stylistic design which shows that Narcisse indeed supersedes Agrippine as "de ce grand corps l'âme toute-puissante," and, as such, is basically necessary to an understanding of the character of Néron.

In Act I, Scene 1, Agrippine tells Albine of Néron: "Il sait, car leur amour ne peut être ignorée, / Que de Britannicus Junie est adorée" (51-52). Actually, Néron does not possess knowledge of his half-brother's passion; it is Narcisse who knows of it, and who only later informs Néron.

NÉRON

Dis-moi, Britannicus l'aime-t-il?

NARCISSE

Quoi! s'il l'aime,

Seigneur? . . .

NARCISSE

N'en doutez point, il l'aime. (427-31)

<sup>12</sup> It may be argued that "ce grand corps," grammatically speaking, refers to any of three possible antecedents: "cour" (92), "Etat" (93), or "sénat" (94)—or to a composite of the three: Rome. Ideologically, however, the "corps" stands for Néron. The theme of Agrippine's whole speech (88-114) is the deterioration of her personal relationship, not with Rome, whose emblems, cited above, are but shadowy generalities compared with the vivid picture of the emperor called up by his mother, but with the emperor himself. Néron is named four times in this speech, which also contains various juxtapositions of the first and third person singular pronouns, all clearly designed to sharpen the impression of Agrippine's spite against a human being, a "corps": Néron.

The mirror exchange between Néron and Narcisse is implicit in the foregoing quotations. Need we then wonder at the unconsciously ironical statement of Britannicus to Narcisse: "Comme toi, dans mon cœur il sait ce qui se passe" (335)?

A suggestion of the mirror motif is offered through the style of Britannicus' subsequent request to Narcisse:

Va donc *voir* si le *bruit* de ce nouvel orage  
 Aura de nos amis excité le courage.  
 Examine leurs yeux, *observe* leurs discours (347-49)

where the device indicated by the italicized words is an exact mirroring of the same device in Néron's celebrated line:

J'entendrai des regards que vous croirez muets (682)

Another such stylistic mirroring occurs between Narcisse's question to Néron: "Que *présage* à mes yeux cette *tristesse* obscure" (379) and the words with which Néron subsequently greets Junie: "Lisez-vous dans mes yeux quelque *triste présage*?" (528).

When, in line 474, Narcisse urges Néron to divorce Octavie, we find the emperor reluctant. He hangs back through fear of Agrippine, and especially of her eyes: "... je n'ose encor démentir le pouvoir / De ces yeux ..." (501-02). Even Narcisse's prompt display of the mirror ("Mais, Seigneur, vous ne la craignez pas: / Vous venez de bannir le superbe Pallas," 493-94) fails, for the moment, to overcome Néron's weak reluctance. The mirror motif is pursued in the emperor's parenthetical "je t'expose ici mon âme toute nue" (499); but Narcisse receives the reflection of the timorous monster and turns it into an image of strength. In the next scene, we find that the image has had its effect, for Néron can so far dispense with his alter ego as to assert to Junie: "Je vous ai déjà dit que je la<sup>13</sup> répudie" (619).

Narcisse has thus already come a long way toward possessing the soul of Néron through the latter's own desires, and we glimpse the process at work in Néron by studying his speech to Narcisse in lines 496-512. The keynote of this speech appears outwardly to be contained in the line "Mon génie étonné tremble devant le sien" (506); but Néron's desires and Narcisse's intimate connection with them are, in this speech, implied by the significance in context of such statements as:

Eloigné de ses yeux, j'ordonne, je menace,  
 J'écoute vos conseils, j'ose les approuver;  
 Je ... tâche à la braver.  
 ... (je t'expose ici mon âme toute nue) (496-99)

Et c'est pour m'affranchir de cette dépendance (507)

... je la fuis.  
 ... je t'arrête ... (510-11)

<sup>13</sup> Octavie.

It seems indeed as if Néron were seeking a new soul to replace Agrippine's "âme toute-puissante" and give him the power to attain his desires, and that he is finding it in the person of Narcisse. In this connection, the juxtaposition of "je la fuis" and "je t'arrête" is peculiarly striking.

We are reminded of this new body-soul combination by Junie's remark to Britannicus during their anguished interview of Act II, Scene 6: "Et jamais l'Empereur n'est absent de ces lieux" (714), for while Néron is offstage in this scene, Narcisse impresses on the spectator his bodily presence as a mute but intently interested witness to Junie's unwilling perfidy.

The Néron-Narcisse duality appears again at the end of Act II, in the soliloquy assigned to Narcisse:

La fortune t'appelle une seconde fois,  
Narcisse; voudrais-tu résister à sa voix?  
Suiuons jusques au bout ses ordres favorables;  
Et pour nous rendre heureux, perdons les misérables. (757-60)

Narcisse's use of the first person plural here presents an ambiguity. His first two lines take the form of an inner dialogue, and thus his "nous" might refer only to himself and his inner interlocutor.<sup>14</sup> But in view of the other evidence of his growing identity with Néron, this interpretation of the speech adds nothing to his dramatic stature; rather, by ascribing to him a motive of self-aggrandizement that is suggested nowhere else in the play, it actually diffuses his character, and thus diminishes his stature. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that Narcisse is thinking of Néron here, for the emperor has just left him; and although, syntactically speaking, "ses ordres" has "la fortune" as its referent, the orders of Néron implicit in lines 754 and 756 patently admit the second part of the ambiguity, which can be resolved in the fact that it is Néron first and foremost who is seeking the perverted happiness expressed in the final line of the act. Therefore, in my opinion, the soliloquy is best interpreted as a stylistic identification of the freedman with the emperor.

The profound effect of Narcisse's mirror is not apparent in Act III, but it comes out strongly in Act IV, Scene 2, when Agrippine confronts Néron and makes her last bid to regain ascendancy over her son—a desperate bid which Néron successfully resists. When we recall the weakling who admitted in Act II, Scene 2, that "mon génie étonné tremble devant le sien," we must, I think, be ready to concede that Narcisse's "... Mais, Seigneur, vous ne la craignez pas" has done its work. Both Néron's new-found ability to maintain a calm arrogance under the scrutiny of his mother's redoubtable eyes and the dissimulation with which he tricks her into believing that he has capitulated to her demands are Narcisse-like traits which show that

<sup>14</sup> In Burrhus' inner dialogue of Act III, Scene 2, however, the first person singular is used consistently throughout.

the two personalities, under impulsion from the stronger, are approaching the point of identity.

This point has not yet been reached, however; for in the following scene, the youthful emperor's still basic inability to keep his own counsel is revealed in his boast to Burrhus: "J'embrasse mon rival, mais c'est pour l'étouffer" (1314). Now Burrhus comes to a full recognition of the force that is drawing Néron toward a life of evil:

BURRHUS

Et qui de ce dessein vous inspire l'envie?

NÉRON

Ma gloire, mon amour, ma sûreté, ma vie.

BURRHUS

Non, quoi que vous disiez, cet horrible dessein  
Ne fut jamais, Seigneur, conçu dans votre sein.

NÉRON

Burrhus!

(1323-27)

Burrhus' "qui" clearly means "who," not "what," as Néron chooses to construe it; and the clarity of the old soldier's perception is attested by Néron's horrified exclamation.

Burrhus then proceeds to his supreme effort to sway the emperor; and it is because he, like Narcisse, appeals to Néron's vanity (1337-85) that he almost succeeds. But in Act IV, Scene 4, Narcisse sets his momentary victory at naught by once more holding up the flattering mirror, not to Néron's fears (as Agrippine may be said to have done), not to his virtue and his duty (as Burrhus has done), but to his "propres désirs," his monstrosity. So by the end of Act IV, the Néron-Narcisse identity is complete, and the monster is born and at large.

It remains to show by what stylistic means Racine implies that Néron the "monstre parfait" has totally assimilated the evil character of his alter ego, and that Narcisse is no longer needed to explain Néron's monstrosity. In his description of the death of Britannicus, Burrhus says: "Mais ceux qui de la cour ont un plus long usage / Sur les yeux de César composent leur visage" (1635-36). In other words, those who know the emperor well enough to suspect him of murder also entertain the well-founded notion that his expression will betray his guilt, for Néron has hitherto never been able to conceal his emotions. Apparently, however, the guile of Narcisse now belongs to Néron ("D'aucun étonnement il ne paraît touché," 1638).

Narcisse, meanwhile, is displaying unwonted naïveté: "Narcisse veut en vain affecter quelque ennui, / Et sa perfide joie éclate malgré lui" (1641-42).

The antithetical gaps between emperor and freedman are being closed up, and the mirror motif is doing double duty: Néron in his demeanor is reflecting Narcisse, while Narcisse reflects the Néron of

Act I, who "laissa sur son visage éclater son dépit" (106). The new-born monster has learned to dissemble, while his teacher has lost the power to do so. But Néron has learned more than a thorough lesson in dissimulation. The fact that he has become a master practitioner of all the evil that Narcisse has represented is attested by Burrhus in the lines: "Ses yeux indifférents ont déjà la constance / D'un tyran dans le crime endurci dès l'enfance" (1711-12).

The death of Narcisse appears adventitious on the surface, and might be regarded as a mere act of obeisance on Racine's part to a moral convention which required that such thoroughgoing rascality be thoroughly punished. The manner of his death, however, bears close scrutiny as the final appearance of the mirror metaphor which points to the symbolic oneness of Néron and Narcisse.

Narcisse . . .

. . . vole vers Junie, et, sans s'épouvanter,

D'une profane main commence à l'arrêter. (1748-50)

Narcisse's behavior here is the counterpart in action of the romantic impulsiveness which Néron, in Act II, revealed in the words: "Depuis un moment, mais pour toute ma vie, / J'aime, que dis-je aimer? j'idolâtre Junie" (383-84).

Néron has finally merged with his mirror. While Narcisse, in a sort of perverse reflection of the swine in the parable, assumes the weaknesses of his master and rushes upon his destruction, Néron, purged of humanity, unfeeling, his eyes on the ground, lets him die. The Roman people, with "mille coups mortels," take symbolic vengeance on Néron's alter ego for the twelve hateful years of violence and indignity that they are to suffer at the hands of the monster which Narcisse brought into the world.

*Russell Sage College*

## THE COURTSHIP SCENE IN *HENRY V*

By PAUL A. JORGENSEN

Henry V's inept manner of courtship, though successful as far as the French princess is concerned, has been unlucky in its appeal to critics of literature. Doctor Johnson disliked its "military grossness"; to Swinburne it had "the savour rather of a ploughman than a prince"; Mark Van Doren was reminded of a "hearty undergraduate with enormous initials on his chest"; and John Palmer found in Henry's conduct the undesirable characteristics which "are most admired in the legendary Englishman."<sup>1</sup> Such strictures have been, however, less convincing than the practical observation that "the wooing scene itself . . . must have been enough to float the play."<sup>2</sup> Proof of the episode's unusual appeal is to be found in the enduring popularity of its comic theme: the difficulties of the bluff soldier in relationship with women.

For it is not as a "legendary Englishman" that Henry proposes to Katherine. His ineptness in courtship is constantly related to the conventional soldierly temperament. "I speak to thee plain soldier," he tells the princess; and again, "take me, take a soldier."<sup>3</sup> The very outset of the wooing stresses the plain soldier's inability to command the niceties of language. "Fair Katherine, and most fair!" the king essays,

Will you vouchsafe to teach a soldier terms  
Such as will enter at a lady's ear . . . ?

Henry then proclaims his inability to "mince it in love." He has "neither the voice nor the heart of flattery" about him. And, equally characteristic of the soldier, he wants the graces of poetry and dancing: "For the one I have neither words nor measure; and for the other I have no strength in measure, yet a reasonable measure in strength." If his apology does not appear convincingly humble, it is because he regards the lack of these polite virtues not as a disgrace, but as credentials for his fitness as a lover. "And while thou liv'st," he advises the princess,

take a fellow of plain and uncoined constancy; for he perforce must do thee right, because he hath not the gift to woo in other places.

Abundant parallels for each of the traits claimed by Henry may be found in Elizabethan depictions of the soldier. One prominent aspect

<sup>1</sup> "Notes on *Henry V.*" *Plays of William Shakespeare* (London, 1765), Vol. 4; *A Study of Shakespeare*, 3rd ed. (London, 1895), p. 105; *Shakespeare* (New York, 1939), p. 176; *Political Characters of Shakespeare* (London, 1945), p. 245.

<sup>2</sup> E. E. Stoll, *Poets and Playwrights* (Minneapolis, 1930), p. 45.

<sup>3</sup> I have used the *Complete Works*, ed. Kittredge (Boston, 1936).

of the king's "plain" appearance is notably common. Henry makes several deprecatory references to his face. It is "not worth sunburning." He "never looks in his glass for love of anything" he sees there. When he comes to woo ladies, he frights them. But his comfort is, "that old age, that ill layer-up of beauty, can do no more spoil upon [his] face"; and he dares hope that Katherine will love him "notwithstanding the poor and untempering effect of [his] visage."

Now there is no historical evidence to justify Henry's slur upon his own beauty.<sup>4</sup> But we need not seek far to justify the severest of judgments upon the soldier's face. Traditionally it was "bearded like the pard."<sup>5</sup> It was characterized by "a Crab-tree looke, a sowre countenance, and a hard favoured visage."<sup>6</sup> Commenting upon types known to physiognomy, Ben Jonson pays detailed attention to "your souldiers face, a menacing, and astounding face, that lookes broad, and bigge: the grace of this face consisteth much in a beard."<sup>7</sup> It would obviously frighten ladies; and in Fletcher's *The Captain* Jacomo's "rusty swarth Complexion" affords women both alarm and amusement.<sup>8</sup>

Henry's supposedly bad face was but one signal aspect of the soldierly convention. Detail by detail, to the verge of monotony, Shakespeare has exploited this low comedy convention throughout the courtship scene.

For this conclusion to the play the dramatist was not significantly indebted to the acknowledged sources. None of the nondramatic histories dealing with Henry V offered justification for the king's inept wooing. In *The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth*, the crude play which gave Shakespeare the general idea for the scene, the king does indeed propose to Katherine bluntly:

Tush Kate, but tell me in plaine termes,  
Canst thou loue the King of England?  
I cannot do as these Countries do,  
That spend halfe their time in woing. . . .<sup>9</sup>

But here is no reference to the soldier, nor, for that matter, any convincing reason for the king's rudeness.

Shakespeare's reinterpretation of this scene apparently relied for its success upon popular appreciation of the plain soldier as a literary convention. But the popularity of the convention is less important

<sup>4</sup> "He had an oval, handsome face with a broad, open forehead and straight nose, ruddy cheeks and lips, a deeply indented chin, and small well-formed ears." C. L. Kingsford, *Henry V: The Typical Medieval Hero* (New York, 1903), p. 81.

<sup>5</sup> *As You Like It*, III, vii, 150.

<sup>6</sup> Barnabe Riche, *The Fruits of Long Experience* (London, 1604), p. 52.

<sup>7</sup> *Cynthia's Reuells*, II, iii, 26-29. Ben Jonson, ed. Herford and Simpson (Oxford, 1932), IV, 70.

<sup>8</sup> II, i and ii. For Beaumont-Fletcher references I have used *Works of Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher*, ed. Glover and Waller (Cambridge, 1905-1912).

<sup>9</sup> *Shakespeare's Library*, ed. W. C. Hazlitt, 2nd ed. (London, 1875), V, 371.



than its trend. And it is in evaluating the play in relation to this trend that we meet an arresting difficulty; for in the Elizabethan drama prior to 1599, the plain soldier in contact with women is commonly exposed as a clownish ruffian. He is especially censured if, like Shakespeare's Henry V, he proclaims his incivility in swaggering fashion. It is necessary to scrutinize this attitude toward the soldier, since Shakespeare could scarcely have wished the hero of his most ardently patriotic play to be finally an object of ridicule.

Basis for the contemptuous attitude toward the rough soldier—particularly one who behaves uncouthly in the presence of women—is to be sought in courtly tradition; and for Elizabethan purposes this is best illustrated in Castiglione's *Courtier*. One of Count Lewis' most felicitous anecdotes—and it is forcefully rendered by Hoby's translation—serves as a reproof to the graceless warrior:

For unto such may well be said, that a worthie gentle woman in a noble assemblie spake pleasantly unto one . . . whom she to shew him a good countenance, desired to daunce with her, and hee refusing it, and to heare musicke, and many other entertainments offered him, alwaies affirming such trifles not to be his profession, at last the gentlewoman demanding him, what is then your profession? he answered with a frowning looke, to fight.

Then saide the Gentlewoman: seeing you are not now at the warre nor in place to fight, I would think it best for you to be well besmured and set up in an armory with other implements of warre till time were that you should be occupied, least you waxe more rustier then you are. Thus with much laughing of the standers by, she left him with a mocke in his foolish presumption.<sup>10</sup>

It is appropriate that from so civilized a group, the plain soldier should be dismissed with urbane derision.

Thomas Churchyard gave early encouragement in England to the attitude rebuked in the *Courtier*:

Dance after drom, let tabber goe, the musyck is nott good  
that macks men lock lyck gyrlls, and mynce on carpaytts gaye . . .  
The sownd off trompett suer, wyll change your maydens face  
A gallant stoering hors, thatt macks a manneg ryghtt  
wear fyttter than a lady fyen, for myghtty marssys Knightt.<sup>11</sup>

Such misguided manliness, lamentable in a genuine soldier like Churchyard, was contemptible in men who adopted uncivil behavior to prove themselves stalwart, and it was towards such that Ascham directed the following rebuke:

And in greater presens, to beare a braue looke: to be warlike, though he neuer looked enimie in the face in warre: yet som warlike signe must be vsed. . . .

But Ascham comforts himself in the knowledge that such counterfeit soldiers are not truly representative of his country, that

<sup>10</sup> Everyman edition (London, 1937), pp. 36-37.

<sup>11</sup> Commendatory Verses to Barnabe Riche's *Allarme to England* (London, 1578).

England hath at this time, manie worthie Capitaines and good souldiours, which be in deede, so honest of behauiour, so cumlie of conditions, so milde of maners, as they may be examples of good order. . . .<sup>12</sup>

John Lyly made of his Sir Thopas just such a one as Ascham deplores. Thopas is not a mere borrowing from Latin comedy. Lyly has enriched the traditional vices of the *miles gloriosus* by a generous infusion of unromantic sentiments. Thopas condescendingly admits that ladies well may love him, but his "tough heart receiveth no impression with sweet words." He is, by virtue of his warlike nature, incapable of gentle sentiments:

There commeth no soft syllable within my lips . . . that pelting word loue, how watrish it is in my mouth, it carrieth no sound; hate, horror, death, are speaches that nourish my spirits.<sup>13</sup>

Lyly also finds occasion to condemn this churlish attitude in genuine soldiers. The warrior Martius advises Midas to scorn the felicities of love as "a pastime for children, breeding nothing but follie, and nourishing nothing but idleness."<sup>14</sup> Although many of Martius' arguments are persuasive and are not totally foreign to the attitude taken by Henry V, the significant aspect of his conduct is that it is authoritatively rebuked, whereas Henry's conduct decidedly is not. Lyly's noblest warriors, such as Alexander, are gentle as well as stalwart; in keeping with the chivalric ideal in general, they join "letters with launces" and "endeuor to be as good Philosophers as soldiers, knowing it no lesse praise to be wise, then commendable to be vailiant."<sup>15</sup>

In the plays of Robert Greene, likewise, will we look in vain for sympathetic depictions of the uncourtly soldier. There is, to be sure, an approximation to the Henry V of the *Famous Victories* in Greene's portrait of Sacrepant, a confirmed warrior who suddenly discovers his love for Angelica. Like Henry V of the early play, Sacrepant resolves to get the romantic business done with a minimum of ceremony:

Then know, my loue, I cannot paint my grief,  
Nor tell a tale of Venus and her sonne . . .  
It fits not Sacrapant to be effeminate.<sup>16</sup>

These words, not particularly engaging in themselves, are the utterance of an unscrupulous warrior, and the reader is in little doubt that Greene approved of neither the wooer nor the wooing.

Of the earlier plays, that which comes closest in spirit to the courtship episode in *Henry V* is *A Pleasaunt Comedie of Faire Em. William the Conqueror* proposes to Mariana as follows:

<sup>12</sup> *The Scholemaster. English Works*, ed. W. W. Wright (Cambridge, 1904), p. 207.

<sup>13</sup> *Endimion*, II, ii, 124-27. All Lyly references are to the *Complete Works*, ed. R. W. Bond (Oxford, 1902).

<sup>14</sup> *Midas*, I, i, 27-28.

<sup>15</sup> *Campaspe*, I, i, 82-84.

<sup>16</sup> *Orlando Furioso*, II, i, 443-46. *Plays and Poems of Robert Greene*, ed. J. C. Collins (Oxford, 1905), I, 235-36.

I cannot, Madam, tell a loving tale . . .  
 That am a soldier sworn to follow arms—  
 But this I bluntly let you understand—  
 I honour you with such religious zeal  
 As may become an honourable mind.<sup>17</sup>

Unlike the *Famous Victories*, this play thus attributes, though casually, the lover's lack of eloquence to his military calling. Equally important is the fact that William is throughout the play a likable character, and this brief episode is not intended to discredit him. Rather, it shows his sincerity. It must be admitted, however, that this plainness is unconvincing. There are none of Shakespeare's well-chosen details to impress upon the audience the fact that a rough soldier is speaking.

We shall, in the main, search vainly through the Elizabethan drama prior to *Henry V* for sympathetic depictions of the soldier who boasts of his defects as a lover or who proposes with convincing inelegance. But there is a nondramatic work which, I believe, influenced Shakespeare's treatment of the courtship scene. In the collection of tales entitled *Riche His Farewell to Militarie Profession* (1581), soldiers are given prominent and favorable attention. The reason is not far to seek. The author, Barnabe Riche, was a professional soldier, was genuinely devoted to the occupation which he supposedly was leaving, and ultimately became "the most prolific writer of the period on the soldier and the soldier's wrongs."<sup>18</sup> Almost certainly Shakespeare knew the *Farewell*. Probably its story "Of Apolonius and Silla" influenced the structure of *Twelfth Night*. And, a fact more pertinent to the present discussion, good evidence has recently been adduced why "Of Two Brethren and Their Wives," a story in the *Farewell*, should be considered an important source of *The Merry Wives*.<sup>19</sup> Since *Henry V* and *The Merry Wives* probably were written within a year of each other, it is not at all unlikely that Shakespeare had the *Farewell* fresh in his mind when he composed *Henry V*.

One of Riche's most vigorous characters is a soldier appearing in "Two Brethren." This ungainly personage has just "lately retourned from the warres, I gesse aboute the same tyme that Kyng Henry the Fift was retourned from the winnyng of Agincourt feelde."<sup>20</sup> Happening to espy a beautiful woman, he is "sodainly stroken into a greate[r] make to see this lampe of light, then ever he had been

<sup>17</sup> Lines 721-26. *The School of Shakspeare*, ed. Richard Simpson (New York, 1878), II, 437.

<sup>18</sup> Lily B. Campbell, *Shakespeare's "Histories"* (San Marino, California, 1947), p. 245.

<sup>19</sup> Dorothy Hart Bruce, "The Merry Wives and Two Brethren," *SP*, XXXIX (1942), 278. Since completing this study, I have learned of T. M. Cranfill's forthcoming edition of the *Farewell*, a work which will do ampler justice to Riche's far-reaching effect on Shakespeare and the drama generally, and which, I believe, will support the Shakespearean indebtedness proposed in the present study.

<sup>20</sup> Shakespeare Society edition (London, 1846), p. 134.

in the feelde to see the ensignes of his enemies."<sup>21</sup> He at first plans to make known his love by means of a letter.

But then he knewe not how to beginne his letter, because souldiours are verie seldome accustomed to endite, especially any of these lovyng lines; and to speake unto her, he was likewise to learne how to use his tearmes. . . .

He nevertheless is able to make a forthright declaration of his love, at which the woman shows seemly alarm. Disturbed but not routed by her modesty, the soldier confesses his inability to meet her on a sophisticated level. "Gentlewoman," he announces,

I am not able to encounter you with wordes, because it hath not been my profession, nor trainyng up, but if you doubte of my love and good likyng, please it you to make triall. . . .

The gentlewoman, who

had never been apposed with such a rough hewen fellowe, that was so blunt and plaine, aswell in his gesture as in his tearmes, beganne to thinke with herself that he might well bee a Souldiour, for she knewe that thei had little skill in the courting of gentlewomen. . . .<sup>22</sup>

The significant aspect of this rather obvious episode is that the soldier's suit is successful, and that he is favored over two more sophisticated individuals, a doctor and a lawyer. What is even more unusual, the woman accepts the soldier because of his very "plainesse," for "she perceived by his countenance the vehemencie of the love he bare unto her. . . ."<sup>23</sup> Her choice proves to be both gratifying and wise. The soldier makes a faithful lover, and later, by means of a cudgeling administered to both doctor and lawyer, he convincingly vindicates her good name.

Riche's endorsement of the soldier's behavior in "Two Brethren" owes much of its sincerity to the manner in which this episode parallels the author's personal endeavor in the book as a whole. Riche, himself a soldier, is self-consciously trying to please "the right courteous Gentlewomen, bothe of Englande and Ireland," to whom he dedicates the *Farewell*. In this undertaking he is sensitive concerning his social deficiencies. He finds in himself "no one maner of exercise, that might give me the least hope to win your good likinges."<sup>24</sup> In a passage suggesting Henry V's misgivings about dancing, he confesses his ineptness in "measures":

although I like the measures verie well, yet I could never treade them aright, nor to use measure in any thyng I went aboute. . . .<sup>25</sup>

<sup>21</sup> *Farewell*, p. 135.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 136.

<sup>23</sup> *Idem*.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4.

<sup>25</sup> *Idem*.

Again, like Henry, he laments his inability to "discourse pleasantly, to drive away the tyme with amorous devises"; nor is he able "to propone pretie questions, or to give readie aunswers. . . ."<sup>26</sup>

But although in his suit to the gentlewomen readers he lays claim to all conceivable courtly disabilities, he obviously means to prosper. "Grosse" and "blunt" though his profession may make him, there is never any question throughout the *Farewell* as to the worth and dignity of the soldier's calling, or as to the superiority of soldiers to courtiers. Riche's noblest hero, Sappho Duke of Mantona, "had no skill in courting trade"; "his voice served hym better to cheare his souldiors in the feeld, then either to fayne or syng ditties in a ladies chamber."<sup>27</sup> Nothing could be further from the author's intentions than that we should deride Sappho for his plainness. Riche's contempt is directed at the courtiers who libeled the duke and procured his banishment.

We see, then, in the *Farewell* a significant reversal of the usual attitude toward the plain soldier. He is not drawn into the picture merely that we may laugh at his ungainly appearance or deride his hostility to the niceties of romance. In Riche the soldier is the hero. He will make, clearly, the best husband; and it is to be regretted that gentlewomen are deceived by accomplished "love makers, suche as can devise to please women with newe fangles, straunge fassions, by praisying of their beauties. . . ."<sup>28</sup>

As unofficial laureate of the English plain soldier, Riche may well have provided—more so than any other one source—the justification for Shakespeare's treatment of the courtship scene. At any rate Riche offered, to whoever would read him, both the most detailed account of the soldier's conventional disabilities and the strongest advocacy of the soldier's worthiness in love.

But whatever may have been Shakespeare's indebtedness to Riche or others in this respect, such indebtedness is scarcely more noteworthy than what happened to the stage soldier in the years following the first performance of *Henry V*. From 1599 forth, the plain soldier of the Elizabethan stage seems to have enjoyed a decisive rise in popular esteem. Contempt was reserved for the sham warrior; and the courtier, no longer the knightly hero of Castiglione, became generally a typed figure of dandyism, appropriately serving as a despicable antagonist for the noble soldier.

In 1599, Dekker gave sympathetic treatment to the difficulties of Orleans, a professedly plain soldier, in love. When his rival for the hand of Agripyne makes the conventional slighting remark, "Me

<sup>26</sup> *Farewell*, p. 5.

<sup>27</sup> "Sappho Duke of Mantona," *Farewell*, p. 23.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 22. Cf. *The Second Tome of the Trauailles and Aduentures of Don Simonides* (London, 1584), Sig. S1, in which Riche gives fuller reasons for preferring the soldier to the courtier as lover.

thinkes, souldiers cannot fal into the fashion of loue," Agripyne defends her unskillful suitor:

Me thinkes, a Souldier is the most faithfull louer of all men els: for his affection stands not vpon complement: his wooing is plaine home-spun stuffe; theres no outlandish thred in it, no Rethoricke: a Souldier casts no figures to get his mistris heart, his loue is like his valour in the field, when he payes downeright blowes.<sup>29</sup>

Orleans has opportunity to prove, as Henry V did not, that the soldier's boast of constancy is well founded, for he, of all Agripyne's suitors, continues to seek her love after she has suffered deformity.

If we accept the evidence of the Commendatory Verses in the First Folio, no Beaumont-Fletcher characters were more highly esteemed than the numerous plain soldiers created by these dramatists. As lovers, these men may be the object of good-natured chaffing. The attitude taken toward them by one mischievous young lady is typical:

I had as lieve be courted by a Cannon,  
As one of those.<sup>30</sup>

There is some basis for her distaste in the ill-favored person of Captain Jacomo, whose ferociousness and limited personality show the realistic imprint of years of battle. Music, after a brief period of discomfort, puts the captain to sleep, and his polite conversation with women is limited to asking "what their shooes cost."<sup>31</sup> But even Jacomo is loved by a young lady, one who rids him of his self-distrust and makes of him a satisfactory lover. Then there is Memnon of *The Mad Lover*, mentioned more frequently than any other character in the Commendatory Verses. This "old rude Souldier," at first the victim of feminine banter, wins respect by offering his heart to the princess whom he loves. This offer is given singular attention because, in Memnon's meaning, it is no figure of speech; his friends barely prevent self-administered surgery. It is such men as Memnon who won for Fletcher's plays this commendation: "Souldiers may here to their old glories adde."<sup>32</sup>

That the Beaumont-Fletcher drama was not extreme in its glorification of the rude soldier is evidenced by the tribute paid by Mas-

<sup>29</sup> *Olde Fortunatus. Dramatic Works* (London, 1873), I, 130. Whether either *Henry V* or *Old Fortunatus* influenced the other in the depiction of soldier as wooer is difficult to judge because of closeness of dates. *Henry V* was performed sometime between March 27 and September 28, 1599. And, according to Chambers (*Elizabethan Stage* [1923], III, 291), *Fortunatus* was played at court on December 27, 1599. But the advantage given to *Henry V* by date of performance is inconclusive, as the Stationers' Register entry for *Fortunatus* suggests that the 1599 play was a revision of the earlier (1596) play on the same subject. Assuredly, however, the episode in Dekker's production could have offered only the slightest of inspiration to Shakespeare.

<sup>30</sup> *The Captain*, I, ii.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, III, iii.

<sup>32</sup> Richard Lovelace, "To Fletcher Reviv'd," Commendatory Verses, First Folio, *Works of Beaumont and Fletcher*, I, xxiv.

singer to Captain Belgarde. This "cast captain" is invited to a ceremonious banquet on condition that he appear in a new suit of clothes. Undaunted, the captain appears "in armor a case of Carbines by his side." "Who stops me now," he asks the admiring assemblage,

Or who dares only say that I appeare not  
In the most rich and glorious habit that  
Renders a man compleate?<sup>33</sup>

Authoritative comment on such behavior is made by his noble host:

I commend,  
This wholesome sharpnesse in you, and prefer it  
Before obsequious tameness, it shewes lovely.<sup>34</sup>

Not merely cast captains were commended for their plainness. Some of the noblest Beaumont-Fletcher warriors are ill at ease in court. And Sir Thomas Overbury, drawing the Character of "A Worthy Commander in the Warres," states:

He is so honourably mercifull to women in surprisall, that onely that makes him an excellent Courtier. He knowes, the hazards of battels, not the pompe of Ceremonies are Souldiers best theaters.<sup>35</sup>

The persistent voices of men like Riche had done much to free from popular contempt the quality which Doctor Johnson termed "military grossness" and to transfer disdain to the simplified courtier type, a figure for whom the provincial Elizabethan temperament felt instinctive distrust. And although Henry V was not fundamentally a rough warrior, Shakespeare was doubtless wise to present him finally and memorably in the role of the plain soldier. No behavior could more aptly symbolize the crude, physically exciting theme of much of the play: French sophistication coming under the heel of English manliness. No behavior could more happily befit the hero of Agincourt, who prevailed

without stratagem,  
But in plain shock and even play of battle. . . .  
(IV, viii, 113-14)

*University of California, Los Angeles*

<sup>33</sup> *The Unnatural Combat*, ed. Talfer (Princeton, 1932), III, iii, 37. For an analogous situation see *The Noble Spanish Soldier* (1634), II, i, Tudor Facsimile Texts (1913).

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, III, iii, 106.

<sup>35</sup> *New Characters* . . . (London, 1615), ed. Paylor (Oxford, 1936), pp. 47-48.



## THE EARLY SCOTS MAGAZINE

By ROBERT C. ELLIOTT

The Scottish intellectual revival of the latter half of the eighteenth century sprang from what seem unlikely roots, for the years preceding 1750 were years of poverty, turmoil (both political and ecclesiastical), and general intellectual sterility. For this reason, perhaps, scholars have paid scanty attention to the early period; but if we wish to understand the generation of men who brought fame to Scotland, we must understand the cultural milieu from which that generation came. A description of a periodical is by no means, of course, a description of a culture. Yet because of the peculiar nature of the eighteenth-century magazine, because the editors felt obliged to satisfy nearly every taste—from the most cultivated to the practically illiterate—the magazine does provide, in a limited sense, an index to the culture of the period; and from this point of view the early files of the *Scots Magazine*, the first and most vigorous of the magazines published in Edinburgh during the eighteenth century, are of interest.

The *Scots Magazine* was founded in 1739 by two booksellers, Alexander Brymer and William Sands, and two printers, James Cochran and Alexander Murray, who joined together to reduce the burden of expense in so ambitious an undertaking. The purposes of the authors, set forth in the preface to the first volume, were: to further the interest of Scotland and to revive the "universal esteem" in which the country was once held; to present an impartial view of politics and of happenings in Europe; to insure that "the Caledonian muse might not be restrain'd by want of a publick Echo to her song"; and, finally, to make money.<sup>1</sup> In plan, in content, and in method, the *Scots Magazine* was admittedly patterned after the recently successful *Gentleman's Magazine* and the *London Magazine*.<sup>2</sup> It was a repository (as were its prototypes) of materials culled from many sources, chiefly from the English weeklies. The preface to the volume for 1750 contains a rhetorical account of the editors' conception of their function. It is their duty

... as publick bees of the literary world, to extract from each fruit and flower some of the most mellifluous juices; and that not only to enrich our common hive, but by the unconfounded, though combined quintessence, to incite the investigation of the salutary forces from whence our sweetness has flowed.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Scots Magazine*, I (1739), i-iii.

<sup>2</sup> Just prior to the appearance of the *Scots Magazine*, Edward Cave, founder of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, wrote: "The Success of the GENTLEMAN'S MAGAZINE has given Rise to almost twenty Imitations of it, which are either all dead, or very little regarded by the World." *The Gentleman's Magazine and Historical Chronicle*, By Sylvanus Urban, Gent., VIII (1738), "To the Reader."

<sup>3</sup> *Scots Magazine*, XII (1750), iii.

This dependent character of the magazine was somewhat mitigated by the editors' encouragement of native contributions; indeed, they sneered at those who were "of so refined, or rather so foreign a taste, as to relish nothing but what they fancy to be the product of our neighboring nation."<sup>4</sup> So small and of so little consequence, however, were the early contributions made by Scottish writers that the *Scots Magazine* may be said to have achieved its success largely as a parasite on London publications.

Like its prototypes, the *Scots Magazine* was divided into sections so devised as to allow the incorporation of the greatest variety of material. The editors' choice of what to include often seems haphazard; it is as though the great diversity of material reflected a lack of clear policy and a fumbling attempt to meet every public taste. However, their emphasis, as they reiterate, was always on the historical and the political; literature, and culture generally, was not ignored, but it was the history of the times that the editors were chiefly interested in.<sup>5</sup>

Reflecting this preoccupation was the "Summary view of publick affairs" which appeared in each January issue of the magazine. This section took up, country by country, the principal events of the preceding year and furnished the reader with background against which to judge the running account of events appearing in each issue. The department "Foreign History" appeared every month; it was compounded of letters, eyewitness reports, rumors, and gossip from the capitals of Europe and the Middle East. Although always tardy and often grossly inaccurate, the "news" served to keep alive readers' interest in the affairs of the world.

An allied department, "Domestick History," concerned itself with affairs, great and small, of Great Britain, which meant, in large measure, London. Here brief accounts of the doings of the nobility, of political crises, of maritime affairs, of hangings and highway robberies, of the discovery of sea monsters, and of natural disasters, all jostled one another for the attention of the reader. A separate section devoted to happenings in Edinburgh was at first very brief (except when a fiery ecclesiastical quarrel seized the attention of the town); during the '45, however, the section was expanded until it dominated all others. This department, too, was a catch-all for the weird variety of news which found its way into the weeklies of the period.

One of the most interesting features of the *Scots Magazine*, a feature which reflected clearly the public's demand for political news, was the "Proceedings of the Political Club," which was lifted bodily from the *London Magazine* each month, starting in July, 1739. The editors of the *Scots Magazine* justify their taking over the debates

<sup>4</sup> *Scots Magazine*, II (1740), iv.

<sup>5</sup> See, for example, the prefaces to volumes III and IX.

intact by arguing that to "alter where there is a probability of excellence, is without dispute commendable; but to change where there is no view of amendment, betrays such a fondness for the writer's own manner as oftener provokes contempt than procures esteem."<sup>6</sup> The "Proceedings of the Political Club" was, of course, a thinly disguised account of the debates in Parliament. The turmoil occasioned by the efforts of Astley of the *London Magazine* and Cave of the *Gentleman's Magazine* to circumvent the law and reproduce Parliamentary speeches is well known.<sup>7</sup> It will perhaps suffice here to note that the echoes of the London fracas appeared faithfully in the *Scots Magazine*, and when in 1747, after several interruptions, the "Political Club" was once more permitted to appear, the Scottish editors expressed their delight and continued to devote about twenty pages of each issue to the debates.

A feature with even more popular appeal was the extensive "Weekly Essays" section. Here essays from the most popular London periodicals were reprinted, often in their entirety, sometimes in summary form. During the early years of its career the *Scots Magazine* drew chiefly upon the weeklies for material. *The Craftsman*, *Daily Gazetteer*, *Common Sense*, *Weekly Miscellany*, *Universal Spectator*, *Champion*, and other publications less well known were all likely to be represented in a single issue, often by more than one article. Later the editors drew heavily on the monthlies, particularly the *Gentleman's Magazine*. Subject matter was as varied as were the interests of the day: politics, theology, moral issues, sentimental tales, scientific experiments, voyages, literature, and the drama—these and a thousand other subjects were represented in kaleidoscopic fashion. Of all the sources upon which they drew the editors took the greatest satisfaction in reprinting *The Rambler*. In 1750 they reproduced twenty-one of Dr. Johnson's essays, and until *The Rambler's* demise in 1752 they continued to draw on it heavily.<sup>8</sup>

Letters to the editor were from the beginning an essential feature of the magazine. Nearly every preface to the bound volumes contains the editors' thanks to their correspondents and their apologies that not everything sent in could be published. Controversial issues were cleverly fanned by the publication of letters first on one side of a problem, then on the other. By proper handling the controversy could thus be kept alive for months, particularly if it were on a theo-

<sup>6</sup> *Scots Magazine*, I (1739), 289.

<sup>7</sup> For a full account of the background and development of the "Political Club" in the *London Magazine* and the "Senate of Magna Lilliputia" in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, see C. Lennart Carlson, *The First Magazine* (Providence, R.I., 1938).

<sup>8</sup> In praise of their source, the editors had this to say in the Preface to the volume for 1750: "Of all those sources to which we have lately had access, none has afforded more pure or more pleasant, more copious or more constant extractions, stronger antidotes to vice or incentives to virtue, than that periodical masterpiece of learning and genius, which diffuses its variety of animated instruction under the apposite name of *THE RAMBLER*."

logical question, and the circulation benefited accordingly. Such tactics required delicate treading, for the Scots took their debates seriously; but the editors pleaded their complete impartiality on all matters, spiritual and temporal, with such frequency and such zeal that all but the most captious seem to have been satisfied.

Several subjects were by their very nature so close to the people's hearts that they were treated at great length in individual issues of the magazine and were returned to time after time in succeeding issues. Such, of course, were the war with Spain (1739) and the War of the Austrian Succession (1740). Out of these great national events came many essays on the tangled political alignments of the day, accounts of battles on land and at sea, stories of heroism and cowardice, and the many ancillary subjects of interest to a people at war. Another topic in which the Scots could be depended on to take a passionate interest was the ecclesiastical disputes which periodically rocked the Kirk. The secession of Ebenezer Erskine and his followers who formed the Associate Presbytery; a long controversy centering around Dr. Campbell's book, *The Necessity of Revelation*; the complex and hotly debated question of whether the ministers' paltry stipends should be augmented, or whether, as the heritors piously claimed, such an augmentation would lead to luxury and sin—these problems, to name but three, claimed the readers' attention month after month and called forth many closely reasoned letters to the editor from men who had been accustomed to confine their eloquence to church councils.

One event above all others, however, was of the highest importance to every Scotsman, whether he read magazines or not. This was, of course, the '45. During these days of civil war the editors of the *Scots Magazine* were properly aware of the historical significance of their mission, which, as they conceived it in the early days of hostilities, was to maintain a strict impartiality at all times; to give equal representation in their magazine to both sides; and to winnow out the truth from the mass of information available. Their position was extremely delicate, and they realized it. The preface to the volume for 1745 contains a plea for freedom of the press and an elaborate justification of their impartiality—a position which obviously gave offense to both parties.

The forces of the rebels occupied Edinburgh in late summer, but the *Scots* continued publication as before under sufferance of the Pretender's son. The magazine carefully avoided invidious names. It referred, not to "the Pretender's son," but to "the Chevalier de St. George"; his forces were not "rebels" but "the highlanders."<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup> The editors were inevitably accused of being sympathetic to the Pretender. Henry Mackenzie speaks of them as "zealous Jacobites"; yet he says "their account of events occurring in 1745 was thought by my father and other Whigs to be very correct." *Anecdotes and Egotisms of Henry Mackenzie, 1745-1831*, ed. Harold William Thompson (London, 1927), p. 29.

All important events, such as the occupation of Edinburgh, the battle of Prestonpans, and the progress of the rebels, were reported from at least two sources. Generally, the King's account of events was represented by the *London Gazette*, which was published by authority. The Pretender's point of view was presented by his official papers and by accounts of happenings given by his representatives. Eyewitness reports and articles from English and Scottish papers supplemented these accounts.

As the cause of the rebels became more and more hopeless, material in the *Scots Magazine* was weighted increasingly toward the Hanoverian side. The editors spoke freely now of "the Pretender's son" and of the "rebels." They were much less scrupulous about presenting the minority interpretation of events. The preface for 1746 contains this remark: "In some sort to gratify the curiosity of our readers, as well as enable them to judge for themselves, we usually gave the accounts published by the rebels, as well as those by the King's troops." This sounds almost apologetic. A request is made for exact and truthful accounts of the rebels' conduct "for we would wish candidly to relate the remarkable outrages committed by the rebels, and likewise the sufferings they bring upon themselves."<sup>10</sup> The first description of the battle of Culloden (April, 1746, issue) is entirely from the point of view of the victors; and when in the volume for 1749 the editors publish a collection of official papers issued by the Pretender and his son, they also publish an essay answering what they call "these treasonable papers." The plea of impartiality had served well when the issue was in doubt; but after Culloden any hint of a taint of Jacobitism would have ruined the magazine, and the editors were content to adopt the majority opinion in their editorial approach to the problem of unity with England.

Although the historical aspects of the magazine were always emphasized, sometimes almost to the exclusion of everything else, literature was not entirely neglected. Each issue contained a section devoted to "Poetical Essays," many of which were sent in by Scottish contributors. The poetic level of these effusions was miserably low. When this fact was brought to the attention of the editors by a correspondent, they admitted the charge, but replied that their poets were nearly all very young and needed encouragement.<sup>11</sup> The poems reprinted from English papers were little better, although occasionally a short poem by Pope was reproduced, and space was found over the months for the whole of Young's *Night Thoughts*. It is an interesting commentary that Latin poems appeared with much greater frequency than did poems in what we now think of as the true Scottish vein: the dialect. From 1739 through 1750 only four dialect

<sup>10</sup> *Scots Magazine*, VIII (1746), 87.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, I (1739), 245-46.

poems appear,<sup>12</sup> and two of those, "The Wife of Auchtermuchty" and "The Vision" are reprinted from Allan Ramsay's *Ever Green*. The two contemporary poems in dialect show an ease and naturalness and humor which set them apart from the efforts of Scotsmen who strained to write "correct" English.

Aside from poetry, literary and critical articles were published, but these were taken almost without exception from the London journals. Original contributions or criticisms (except on theological tracts) were very rare.

An early feature of the magazine was a monthly letter from London signed by "Toupee." This was a chatty, rather flippant essay on the London theater, the opera, Vauxhall, or the follies of the town in general. It was entertainingly written and generally amusing, but its impudent tone may be presumed to have offended the unsophisticated Scots audience; at any rate, the letter was dropped after several months.<sup>13</sup>

The *Scots Magazine* published relatively fewer extracts from books than did the London magazines. In January, 1742, however, appeared "A character of Sir Robert Walpole. Taken from the Essays moral and political, vol. 2. lately published at Edinburgh." This was David Hume's characterization of the Prime Minister shortly before his downfall.<sup>14</sup> It is a short, balanced, incisive judgment. "As I am a man, I love him; as I am a scholar, I hate him; as I am a Briton, I calmly wish his fall." Just before the essay was published, Walpole's end was in sight. Hume added in his prefatory remarks the following mitigative statement:

I must confess, that, at present, when he seems to be on the decline, I am inclined to think more favourably of him, and to suspect, that the antipathy, which every true born Briton naturally bears to ministers of state, inspired me with some prejudice against him.<sup>15</sup>

In March of the same year the editors introduced a second article on the subject by this statement:

The character of Sir Robert Walpole . . . was inserted in most of the newspapers of G. Britain: And in the Newcastle paper, the following queries were proposed to the consideration of the author; who having favoured us with his answers, we shall insert them, each under the query to which it belongs.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>12</sup> *Scots Magazine*, VII (1745), 274-75; X (1748), 275-78; XII (1750), 42-43, 113. Another poem, III (1741), 455, tried unsuccessfully to intersperse a small amount of dialect with a stilted English style.

<sup>13</sup> A correspondent wrote to the editors: "I have heard it suggested, on reading Mr. Toupee's letter in March, that you favoured the Cou-t: And many serious people think his letters in general of little use." *Ibid.*, I (1739), 245.

<sup>14</sup> Hume later withdrew this essay from his collected works. See David Hume, *Essays Moral, Political, and Literary*, ed. T. H. Green and T. H. Grose (London, 1875), I, 45.

<sup>15</sup> *Scots Magazine*, IV (1742), 39.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, IV (1742), 119. For a discussion of this hitherto unrecognized material by Hume, see my article "Hume's 'Character of Sir Robert Walpole': Some Unnoticed Additions," *JEGP*, XLVIII (1949), 367-70.



Then follow the questions raised by the Newcastle paper and the answers of Hume.

Like the London periodicals, the *Scots Magazine* conducted a number of miscellaneous departments. It announced briefly notable marriages and deaths and carried a statistical analysis of deaths "within the walls"; it listed preferments, civil, military, and ecclesiastical; it listed the price of oats at Edinburgh and of stocks at London; during the war it itemized the ships captured by the British and those lost to the enemy; and finally it noted the new books published in London (and later those published in Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Dublin). Miscellaneous as these departments were, they constituted an important and valued feature of the magazines of the day.

Although the popularity of the *Scots Magazine* did not wane for a number of years after 1750, its chief interest to historians today lies in its coverage of the years before the middle of the century. Documentation for the years after 1750 is fairly adequate, even without the *Scots*. What the magazine lacks in historical importance during the latter half of the century, however, it perhaps makes up in literary interest. A very brief mention of some of its notable contributors should make the point.<sup>17</sup> The blind poet Thomas Blacklock had early published two poems in the magazine: the first in January, 1747, the second in November, 1749; and he continued to send in occasional contributions. Early, and undistinguished, lyrics by "Ossian" Macpherson were published in May, 1755, and in October, 1758. John Home, the distinguished dramatist, was represented by his dream-vision "The Fate of Caesar" in August, 1758. Merely to list Boswell's contributions in verse and prose requires five printed pages; among them should be mentioned the following: the verses on the drowning of Theophilus Cibber; the Prologue which Boswell wrote for the opening of the Theatre Royal in Edinburgh; a series of "Letters from Rome" (reprinted from the *London Magazine*); and considerable material on the Douglas case and on Donaldson's case involving literary copyright.<sup>18</sup> Henry Mackenzie has an interesting, although inaccurate, account of sending his juvenile poems to the "very respectable" publishers of the *Scots Magazine* and of his joy at seeing them in print.<sup>19</sup> These, together with the best poems he ever wrote, the ballads "Duncan" and "Kenneth," appeared between 1763 and 1765.

When in 1826 the *Scots Magazine* failed, victim of an unimaginative stodginess into which the great Constable himself had been unable to

<sup>17</sup> For a more complete discussion of the point, see D. S. M. Imrie, "The Story of the Scots Magazine," *The Scots Magazine, A Monthly Miscellany of Scottish Life*, Dundee (June, 1939), XXXI, 218 ff.

<sup>18</sup> See Frederick Albert Pottle, *The Literary Career of James Boswell, Esq.* (Oxford, 1929), pp. 215-21.

<sup>19</sup> *Anecdotes and Egotisms*, pp. 184-85.



infuse life, even the rival *Blackwood's* expressed nostalgic regret. The shepherd in "Noctes Ambrosianae" says:

She [the *Scots*] was indeed . . . an honest auld body, and till she gòt into the natural dotage that is the doom o' a' flesh, she wasna wantin' in smeddum, and could sing a sang, or tell a story, wi' nae sma' speerit. She was really an amusin' chronicler o' the bygone times, and it was pleasant now and then, on a Saturday nicht, to tak a dish o' tea wi' her; and hearken to her clish-maclavers about the forty-five.<sup>20</sup>

*Ohio State University*

---

<sup>20</sup> *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, XX (July-December, 1826), 786.

## HOPKINS' "AS KINGFISHERS CATCH FIRE"

By SELMA JEANNE COHEN

As kingfishers catch fire, dragonflies draw flame;  
As tumbled over rim in roundy wells  
Stones ring; like each tucked string tells, each hung bell's  
Bow swung finds tongue to fling out broad its name;  
Each mortal thing does one thing and the same:  
Deals out that being indoors each one dwells;  
Selves—goes itself; *myself* it speaks and spells,  
Crying *What I do is me: for that I came.*

I say more: the just man justices;  
Keeps grace: that keeps all his goings graces;  
Acts in God's eye what in God's eye he is—  
Christ—for Christ plays in ten thousand places,  
Lovely in limbs and lovely in eyes not his  
To the Father through the features of men's faces.

Because Gerard Manley Hopkins was a writer of religious verse, many critics have been tempted to consider his poems simply as rhythmic versions of themes that might as well have been presented in sermons. That Hopkins himself would have expected poems to be judged as art and not as theology may be seen from his own definition of poetry as "... speech framed to be heard for its own sake and interest even over and above its interest of meaning."<sup>1</sup> Therefore, to consider Hopkins' lyrics only as restatements of doctrine is to neglect a part of the art of poetry as he conceived it, for in Hopkins' scheme the poet is expected to exploit the full potentialities of words, using them for their music and for their power to convey sentiment as well as for their thought. Hopkins' definition is stated in terms of the end of poetry, for he calls that end one of "interest," not of moral or religious profit, though "interest" of meaning may well be moral or religious. Poetry, however, is also sound, and music in itself may be of interest "over and above" that of any theological doctrine which may be conveyed by the meaning of the words.

Hopkins drew a distinction between theology and lyric on the basis of his definition of poetic interest. He wrote to Robert Bridges:

... I am going to preach tomorrow and put plainly to a Highland congregation of MacDonalds, MacIntoshes, and MacKillops, and the rest what I am putting not at all so plainly to the rest of the world, or rather to you and Canon Dixon, in a sonnet in sprung rhythm with two codas.<sup>2</sup>

That the poem expresses the idea "not at all so plainly" is not accidental; the kinds of interest which a poem must achieve account for

<sup>1</sup> *Note-Books and Papers of Gerard Manley Hopkins* (London, 1937), p. 249.

<sup>2</sup> *Letters of Gerard Manley Hopkins to Robert Bridges*, ed. Claude C. Abbott (London, 1935), p. 279.

the difference. Hopkins planned to offset this barrier to intelligibility by writing arguments for his poems. Like so many of his projects this one was never accomplished, but he recognized the need and explained it in terms of the nature of his art.

Epic and drama and ballad and many, most, things should be at once intelligible; but everything need not and cannot be. Plainly if it is possible to express a subtle and recondite thought on a subtle and recondite subject in a subtle and recondite way and with great felicity and perfection, in the end, something must be sacrificed, with so trying a task, in the process, and this may be the being at once, nay perhaps even the being without explanation at all, intelligible. Neither, in the same light, does it seem to me a real objection (though this one I hope not to lay myself open to) that the argument should be even longer than the piece; for the merit of the work may lie for one thing in its terseness.<sup>3</sup>

Because Hopkins' poems are "subtle and recondite" and also "terse," the provision of a set of arguments would not be inconsistent with his own wishes. The sphere of such documentation is a large but not unlimited one. As suggested in the first letter quoted, his own theological writings may illuminate the ideas utilized in his poems, and—in so far as Hopkins wanted poems to represent Christian truths—the Bible and Church Fathers, from whom he adopted his thought, are other likely sources. Whether or not Hopkins had in mind a certain passage from a theologian when he wrote a particular poem need not affect the validity of the elucidation it offers, for he knew the Catholic writers so intimately that their ideas and even their statements of them were—for all practical purposes—identifiable with his own.

However, it must be remembered that this mode of documentation will not explain a whole poem; Hopkins wished to express his thought "in a subtle and recondite way and with great felicity and perfection." Any analysis of his work must, then, take these latter qualifications into account. This discussion of one of Hopkins' most important sonnets is an attempt to investigate the author's poem in terms relevant to his own criteria.

"As Kingfishers Catch Fire" deals with the concept of individuality viewed first as that possessed by "each mortal thing" and then as it appears in the "just man." In the notes for his commentary on the *Spiritual Exercises* of Saint Ignatius, Hopkins claims that man is potentially more distinctive than are irrational beings by virtue of his freedom, which is the consequence of a rational nature. The entity resulting from the exertion of this freedom is properly a "self" which ". . . is identified with pitch, moral pitch, determination of right and wrong."<sup>4</sup> Hopkins conceived of man's freedom as enhancing his individuality only in so far as man chooses the right object of allegiance.

Nevertheless in every circumstance it is within God's power to determine the creature to choose, and freely choose, according to his will; but not without a change or access of circumstance over and above the base act of determination on

<sup>3</sup> *Letters of Hopkins to Bridges*, pp. 265-66.

<sup>4</sup> *Note-Books*, p. 325.

his part. This access is either of grace, which is "supernature," to nature or of more grace to grace already given, and it takes the form of instressing the affective will or affecting the will towards the good which he proposes.<sup>5</sup>

Because this accession of grace is exhibited in free choice, it is most plainly seen in activity; it is "action, correspondence"<sup>6</sup> on the part of man which enables him to say "... that is Christ *being me* and me *being Christ*."<sup>7</sup>

Hopkins' notes contain frequent references to the writings of Marie Lataste, who gives particular emphasis to the conception of grace as correspondence.

God wills the salvation of all men. . . . What has He done for that end? . . . He wills it, but with a conditional will; provided man endeavors to profit by means of the salvation which He gives him; provided he corresponds to His graces, which will never fail him.<sup>8</sup>

It is by grace that man acts as Christ, and grace may be identified with the supernatural life conferred on man, who cannot achieve such a condition independently. "The supernatural life is not the life of man in man, it is the life of God operating in man."<sup>9</sup> And Christ, speaking to Marie Lataste, confirms Hopkins' assertions about the results of grace, further indentifying the person in a state of grace as a member of His Body and as the "just man."

Now man by grace becomes a member of My body, and being united to Me, he is just, he is holy, he is the friend of God, he is the son of God, and his sonship, this friendship, this holiness, this justice shine in him in all their splendour and manifest Me who am one with Him.<sup>10</sup>

A just man is one who is free from mortal sin. . . . He has in him the life of God; consequently he has part in all My merits, he has part also in all My prayers and all the good works that are done in My Church of which he is a living member.<sup>11</sup>

In line with this, Hopkins writes that "justice in the Scripture means goodness."<sup>12</sup> He then asserts that this quality is discernible in all actions of the man who corresponds to grace. "When a man is in God's grace and free from mortal sin, then everything that he does, so long as there is no sin in it, gives God glory."<sup>13</sup> For man to give God glory is for him to act as an image of his Maker; he should be "God's glass to look in,"<sup>14</sup> should show God His own glory.

Grace, then, is a matter of correspondence, of action, by which man is moved to act in the Godlike manner of which he is potentially

<sup>5</sup> *Note-Books*, p. 325.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 332.

<sup>7</sup> *Idem*.

<sup>8</sup> *Letters and Writings of Marie Lataste* (London, 1881), I, 47.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 64.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 10.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 358.

<sup>12</sup> *Note-Books*, p. 289.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 304.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 303.

capable. There are, in Hopkins' terms, aids, placed on earth by God, which help man to know Him whom he desires to imitate. These aids constitute no less than all the objects in the world, for all are of His creation. By perceiving in the sensible image the prototype of its beauty, man achieves an insight into the nature of God. Thus Hopkins wrote: "I do not think I have ever seen anything more beautiful than the bluebell I have been looking at. I know the beauty of our Lord by it."<sup>15</sup> "Inscape" refers to the ultimate reality—God—but also to reflections of Him observable in the world; a perception of "inscape" in the world is a recognition of the relation of any earthly object to its Maker. Yet while "inscape" is a fact, it is only the man in a state of grace, one who is granted supernatural powers of insight, who is able to recognize it. "I thought how sadly the beauty of inscape was unknown and buried away from simple people and yet how near at hand it was if they had eyes to see it and it could be called out everywhere again."<sup>16</sup>

In "As Kingfishers Catch Fire" these various propositions are not only combined but are assimilated into an essentially lyric structure. The two parts of Hopkins' sonnet are sharply differentiated. The octet itself may be divided into two parts: the first four lines are remarks about particular instances that are "like" one another, and the nature of their similarity is summarized in the next four lines. The sestet, however, deals not with comparisons of "mortal things" but with the relation between mortals and an immortal. The change is more than a mere shift in attention, for the later statements constitute a development of ideas implicit in the initial expression.

In the beginning of the poem specific manifestations of selfhood are observed in sights and sounds. Both "kingfishers" and "dragonflies" are seen to attract that substance most like themselves in appearance, for their plumage reflects the brilliance of "fire" and "flame." Their actions, therefore, are expressive of their most striking features and are characteristic of them. Yet while these actions distinguish and bring out the particularity of each creature, they also provide a basis for observing the likenesses of these creatures; both do those things most distinctive of themselves.

The observer now turns from sights in the sky to sounds on the earth. The next three lines, while they deal with inanimate objects, treat them as self-expressive. Each sounds and thereby communicates its distinctive nature. Although kingfishers "catch" and dragonflies "draw" and stones "tumble" and "ring" by themselves, these other objects—even though moved by an external force—still sound expressively. A string when struck and a bell when swung will sound their own natures and not the mover's.

<sup>15</sup> *Note-Books*, pp. 133-34.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 161.

Perhaps the most striking feature of the sound pattern in these lines is the use of alliteration and internal rhyme. That the first part of the poem deals with a progression of identifications may offer a clue to the function of these devices. In the first line, for example, the relation between action and nature is enforced by the identical initial sounds in "kingfishers catch" and "dragonflies draw," while the second part of each name alliterates with that of the object of its actions: "kingfishers . . . fire" and "dragonflies . . . flame." A similar use of alliteration combined with internal rhyme is made in lines three and four. "Stones ring; like each tucked string tells, each hung bell's / Bow swung finds tongue. . . ." The identifications may be discerned in both meaning and sound.

All objects, whether natural or made by man, act themselves. In so doing, they excite the observer by the beauty of color or of sound; although creatures are self-expressive by nature, they are—in simply performing their natural functions—most comely. These manifestations of self and of beauty are practically automatic; they are stated simply as facts to be observed and not as results of deliberation. Even though the "bell's/Bow swung finds tongue," no mention is made of purpose or desire. Thus, the summary is stated purely in terms of action. But the statement is significantly qualified to refer only to "each mortal thing." While man might well be included in this designation, he would be considered in this category as little more than an automaton, a "thing." Yet the term "mortal" is indicative of a potential distinction, for no claim is made that reality is composed of exclusively "mortal" creatures.

Line 5 names two characteristics of "mortal" action: first, each "thing" does "one thing"—that which is peculiar to it; and second, each "thing" is similar in this respect. These generalizations are now used to infer something about the nature of these creatures. It is notable, however, that the first statement about essence, as opposed to action, is contained in a subordinate clause. What each "thing" expresses is now identified not merely with its "name"—which, in its superficial meaning is only an arbitrary designation—but with the "being" that "indoors each one dwells." The creature, therefore, expresses an essential nature which has an objective existence regardless of the acuity of the person perceiving it. Although the mind notes the similarity of these various objects, its perception may be faulty. But once "that being indoors each one dwells" is stated as a fact, it is asserted to be a truth independent of man's observation. The ablaut observable in "*deals*" and "*dwells*" is further evidence of the essential identity of outward action and inner being.<sup>17</sup> The subject of the poem

<sup>17</sup> Hopkins follows Duns Scotus in distinguishing a thing's individuality from its existence. All the things in the sonnet have existence in common with one another, yet each is distinctive. This is in accord with Duns's distinction between an object's common nature and the *haecceitas* which constitutes the individual. Duns also argues that activity may be essential as well as accidental, and that the

is shifting from appearance to reality. Thus, when line 7 reiterates the individualizing character of the actions of mortal things, it carries more meaning than did the earlier lines of which it may seem a mere repetition. The speaking of "self" is now seen as the outward manifestation of an essential inner being.

Thus, as the creature directly "speaks" its own nature and that nature is inferred from the quality of its actions, "spelled," and then read by the observer, it communicates "itself." But it does more than identify its actions with its nature, cry "*What I do is me.*" It also states that this self-expression is the purpose for which it was made, "*for that I came.*" The progression exhibited in the octet is, therefore, one of increasing concern with factors grasped by the acute mind. The particular items noted in the first three lines are perceived by the senses, and the only mental act required is that of comparing observed data, remarking that the actions of these objects are similar. The latter part of line 5 goes further to identify the basis of similarity, for "as" the birds and "like" the stone and string, each bell flings "out broad its name." The objects heretofore observed are next qualified as "mortal" things, and a "being" is attributed to them. Although these objects are then represented as themselves "*crying . . . for that I came,*" the statement of motive demands more than sensory proof. The tendency of the remarks is to draw away from any conception of the accidental in this coalescence of nature and expression. These acts take place not only in specific instances but in "each mortal thing"; they deal out an actually existent "being," and are deliberate because they represent the purpose of each thing.

As the movement of the sonnet so far has been towards the realization of the deliberate and purposive act, an extension of this factor may be sought in the sestet, and the words of line 9 indicate the fulfillment of this expectation. The speaker emphatically stresses two words in the first clause. "*I say móre.*" The preceding data may be perceived by any person; the latter only by one possessing insight. The poet here distinguishes himself as speaking from a higher though not different perspective, and—if the progression of the octet is to be developed—observations on behavior more deliberate than any heretofore noted may be expected.

This emphasis on the capacity of the observer is in accord with Hopkins' theory of insight, which postulates that only the man of a particular—actually Christian—character may perceive ultimate reality. As the final statements of the poem represent a recognition of "inscape"—the ultimate reality which is the relation of the creature to God—that recognition is dependent upon powers granted to the observer by God. The man who perceives the motive of "each mortal thing" may still be incapable of insight into the immortal. Now that

---

former distinguishes in respect to the thing's essence. The final distinction is one of individuality. Thus the poet perceives individuality through observations of essential activity.



the speaker has been identified as one who can "say more," a statement of "inscape" is possible.

The poet's first words in this newly defined character refer to the actions of another "mortal thing"—man—and so all the assertions already made about such creatures automatically refer to man. Thus, the speaker claims that he says "more," not that he is beginning to affirm anything different or contradictory. He speaks not merely of "man" but of the "just man" who—like all creatures—acts his own nature, "justices." The repetition of sound is a reflection of the identification similar to that observed in "as kingfishers catch fire"; the first line of the sestet parallels the initial line of the poem. The exact meaning of "justice" is defined in the next clause as "keeps grace." The "just man" is, therefore, the one who is in a state of grace "that keeps all his goings graces." The actions are graces because they are comely—like those of other creatures—and also because they are "just"—exhibiting beauty of character which is accessible only to man.

As behavior has been shown to reflect the nature of the actor, man's actions give evidence of his being in a state of grace; the expression of justice is as necessary a quality of his actions as is the self-expression of the objects remarked in the octet. But man is not naturally "just." He attains that condition only by deliberate choice of relinquishing his natural personality for that individuality endowed by supernatural grace. The "just man," therefore, "keeps grace" that is not naturally his own; it is given to him, and he must voluntarily choose to retain it.

This man is then identified with Christ, by which association he becomes "more" than a "mortal thing." Yet the statements make clear that not all men achieve this correspondence but only the "just man." "Justice" or "grace" is, therefore, a gift granted to man over and above his endowments as a "mortal." When it is granted, man "acts" Christ, because his "being"—that which he expresses—actually "is Christ"; his choice makes man justified "in God's eye." The repetition of the last phrase serves to set off this identification; man "acts" what he "is," like all creatures he "deals out that being" that "dwells" in him. All his actions are performed by virtue of God's grace and therefore through Christ; this is really Christ acting in man.<sup>18</sup> Christ in man "plays in ten thousand places," because his sphere is greater than any possibly available to "mortal" sight but always present to "God's eye." This "play" is perceived in loveliness; as the light of fire "plays" upon the kingfisher, so the light of Christ plays upon man. The "goings" of the "just man" are "graces" because they are radiant with this supernatural "fire" and "flame."<sup>19</sup> Man is "lovely" by virtue of

<sup>18</sup> Cf.: "... not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." Gal. 2:20.

<sup>19</sup> Hopkins identified this light-giving grace with the Pentacostal tongues of fire, the Holy Ghost. "Christ himself was but one and lived and died but once;

his keeping "grace," by being Christ who is "lovely in eyes not his"; the "just man" is a member of Christ's body.<sup>20</sup> To the omniscient observer, God, all this is perceivable in "the features of men's faces." God is appropriately called "the Father," because His image is reflected in His sons. The "inscape" is stated by the poet but perceived by God who sees the relation of the "just man" to Himself.

The progression of the poem may, then, be viewed in terms of the development of both the object of perception, moving from "each mortal thing" to the "just man," and of the nature of the perceiver who must himself be "just" to gain insight into the relation between God and man. The actions of the man who "keeps grace" are like those of "kingfishers" and "dragonflies" because they are beautiful but they are also deliberate. They are self-expressive, yet they reflect not the "mortal" aspect of man but rather his spiritual nature which has been raised by grace to something "more" than "mortal," and which thereby makes all man's "goings graces." Because the will to correspond is voluntary and deliberate, man is free to choose or to refuse the life of Christ. If his will is turned towards that which God has proposed for him, all his acts give God glory, and he may say "*for that I came.*" His purpose, like that of irrational creatures, remains self-expression. But for the "just man" this is acting in accordance not with his natural self but with the supernatural character bestowed on him through grace. He chooses to act Christ rather than the baser qualities of his "mortal" nature, and in so acting he becomes like Christ, an image of the Father—"God's glass to look in" that shows Him back His own glory. Because no "mortal thing" other than man possesses this freedom of choice, man alone can achieve this higher individuality, and—as indicated by the poet's observations in the octet, which were restricted to "each mortal thing"—no other creature can be aware of anything more worth expressing than itself. But the "just man" in acting himself—as all things do—is cognizant of acting "in God's eye," and the poem ends when the highest type of "mortal thing" is seen to communicate its affinity with the immortal.

*American School of Dance  
Hollywood, California*

---

but the Holy Ghost makes of every Christian another Christ, an After-Christ; lives a million lives in every age; is the courage of the martyrs, the wisdom of the doctors, the purity of the virgins; is breathed into every baptism, may be quenched by sin in one soul but then is kindled in another; passes like a restless breath from heart to heart and is the spirit and the life of all the Church; what the soul is to the human body that, St. Austin says, the Holy Ghost is to the Church Catholic, to Christ's body mystical." Unpublished sermon, taken from a typescript made at Campion Hall, Oxford. I am indebted to Father Thomas Corbishley for permission to quote from these unpublished sermons.

<sup>20</sup> Cf.: "For as the body is one and hath many members, and all members of that body being many, are one body; so also is Christ. For by one spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." I Cor. 12:12, 13.

POE'S ZENOBIA:  
AN EARLY SATIRE ON MARGARET FULLER\*

By THOMAS H. McNEAL

"I wonder, sir," said he, "whether you know a lady whom they call Zenobia?"  
—*Blithedale Romance*

In the *American Museum of Literature and the Arts* for November, 1838, appeared Edgar Allan Poe's "The Psyche Zenobia." It is a satirical skit, taking for its target a class of exaggerated tales appearing in *Blackwood's Magazine*; and it encloses a second tale, "The Scythe of Time," a burlesque of what is supposed to be a real *Blackwood's* story of "sensations" and "intensities."<sup>1</sup> Miss Psyche Zenobia, authoress extraordinary, writes both tales. The first is her account of how she is sent by the Association to Civilize Humanity to Mr. Blackwood, and how she is advised by him on the sort of article he wishes her to write for his magazine; the second is the article itself, which she has composed under his direction—that wretched tale of Poe's in which Miss Zenobia goes up into the belfry of a cathedral, looks out an aperture, and has her head gradually cut off by the long hand of a clock on the wall outside.

These works saw two more printings during Poe's lifetime. They appeared as separate though consecutive pieces in the *Tales of the Grotesque and Arabesque*, dated 1840—in this edition bearing the titles "The Signora Zenobia" and "The Scythe of Time." Their third printing was in the *Broadway Journal*, July 12, 1845, where they are again separate yet consecutive tales, and are renamed "How to Write a Blackwood Article" and "A Predicament," under which titles they are read today. The title changes, it may be said, reflect certain other alterations and additions made within the works themselves for a projected new edition of the *Tales of the Grotesque and Arabesque* under the proposed title of *Phantasy Pieces*—a book which was contemplated in 1842 but which never appeared.<sup>2</sup> In this revision a motto was given each story, and one passage was considerably revised.

\* Read at the American Literature section of the South Atlantic MLA meeting, November, 1948.

<sup>1</sup> Poe had already burlesqued *Blackwood's* in a tale first called "A Decided Loss" (*Saturday Courier*, November 10, 1832), renamed "Loss of Breath" (*Southern Literary Messenger*, September, 1835). J. K. Paulding, writing to T. W. White, editor of the *Messenger*, March 3, 1836, says: "His quiz on Willis, and the Burlesque of 'Blackwood' were not only capital, but what is more, were understood by all." This commendation by Paulding, passed on by White, may have encouraged Poe to continue the satire in another tale. *Complete Works of Edgar Allan Poe*, ed. James A. Harrison (1902), XVII, 378.

<sup>2</sup> A. H. Quinn, *Edgar Allan Poe* (New York, 1942), pp. 336-37.

Such is the history of the tales in general and the usual editorial comment upon them.<sup>3</sup> What the critics have failed to point out, however, is that there is in the tales considerably more satire than that directed at *Blackwood's*—a bitter invective against Transcendentalism and, in particular, what appears to be a tirade against Margaret Fuller, who is probably caricatured as Miss Psyche Zenobia, heroine and narrator of both tales.

Now such a discovery brings to mind certain later literary portraits of Miss Fuller, and new problems are almost inevitably created: Is Miranda of Lowell's *A Fable for Critics* at all a copy of Poe's Zenobia? What is the connection between the Zenobia of Poe's satires and Hawthorne's Zenobia of *The Blithedale Romance*?<sup>4</sup>

Although in 1838 Miss Fuller was not yet Poe's only serious American rival in literary criticism, as she became six years later,<sup>5</sup> she was, nevertheless, a well-known and much marveled at "blue stocking." Everyone around Boston had heard of her. In February of that year she saw into print her fifth piece of writing. Each was an essay of erudition, and the last four were published in the *Western Messenger*, placed there by one of her longstanding friends, James Freeman Clarke, who had left Harvard for various pulpits and was at the time editor of that journal in Cincinnati. She had known Clarke in Cambridge, where she lived from 1824 until 1835. Many men of the famous Harvard classes of '29 and '33 were her friends and correspondents. She knew well Frederic Henry Hedge, who came back from studies in Germany with a word called "transcendentalism" that he had borrowed from Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*—and used it first in the *Christian Examiner* (edited by William Ware, a man of importance later on in this paper) for March, 1833.<sup>6</sup> In 1836 when a "symposium" sponsored by Emerson, Hedge, Ripley, and Putnam was loosely organized into what is now called the Transcendental Club, Margaret Fuller attended the second meeting at Bronson Alcott's home—and women were at last accepted on an equal footing with men. She taught as did Elizabeth Peabody—another charming female bookworm, and sister to the later Mrs. Hawthorne and Mrs. Horace Mann—in Alcott's ill-fated Temple School, reading German the while with the great William Ellery Channing. (His nephew

<sup>3</sup> Killis Campbell, *The Mind of Poe and Other Studies* (Cambridge, Mass., 1933), pp. 139, 162; J. W. Robertson, *Bibliography of the Writings of Edgar A. Poe* (San Francisco, 1934), p. 13, and *Commentary on the Bibliography of Edgar A. Poe* (San Francisco, 1934), p. 117; C. F. Heartman and J. R. Canny, *A Bibliography of the First Printings of the Writings of Edgar Allan Poe* (Hattiesburg, Miss., 1943), p. 58; A. H. Quinn, *op. cit.*, p. 272.

<sup>4</sup> Margaret Fuller's personality and eccentricities left their mark on numerous minds of the day. Sixteen years after Poe's last revision of the tales, O. W. Holmes' *Elsie Venner* (1861) presented for its heroine a partial portrait of her. See Van Wyck Brooks, *The Flowering of New England* (New York, 1937), p. 431 n.; and the *Oxford Companion to American Literature* (New York, 1941), p. 222.

<sup>5</sup> Mason Wade, *Margaret Fuller* (New York, 1940), p. xiii.

<sup>6</sup> Mason Wade, *Writings of Margaret Fuller* (New York, 1941), p. 595.

Ellery, the improvident poet, was to marry her sister Ellen in 1842.<sup>7</sup>) In fact Margaret Fuller could easily have said with her friend Thoreau: "I have never got over my surprise that I should have been born into the most estimable place in all the world." Her local fame was wide, and she was already being called the "Queen of Cambridge." Thus by the year 1838 Miss Fuller was the leading female light among a group of literati whom Poe detested.<sup>8</sup>

Poe's information regarding these goings-on in Boston and its vicinity evidently derived largely from his residence in New York during 1837-1838. He came there after a number of successful years as editor of the *Southern Literary Messenger* in Richmond, but remained for only a little over twelve months, moving on to Philadelphia,<sup>9</sup> where "The Psyche Zenobia," with its setting in that city, was very likely written.

Poe's use of Queen Zenobia as a screen behind which to burlesque Margaret Fuller is understandable enough. Miss Fuller's high-handedness and regal bearing had not escaped comment. Interest in classical history and literature, too, was widely evident in the period; Miss Fuller herself in 1839, within a year after Poe's satires were published, was holding Conversations on Greek Mythology. But more important and almost certainly a definite suggestion to Poe was the appearance of the work by the Unitarian clergyman William Ware, *Letters . . . from Palmyra* (1837), called *Zenobia* after the English reprints in subsequent editions. Nowhere in his book, so far as I can see, is there evidence that Ware had Miss Fuller in mind when he drew the portrait of Queen Zenobia. But Van Wyck Brooks notes, with no reference to either Poe or Hawthorne, that Ware's heroes and heroines in general "savored a little too much of Dr. Channing's circle."<sup>10</sup> And again, in speaking of the works of certain American sculptors in Rome, he says: "Zenobia was a favorite subject, the heroine of William Ware's novel, a true New England woman born too soon."<sup>11</sup> Poe seems merely to have seized a grotesque comparison and perverted it to his own ends, within a year after Ware's novel was in the hands of its readers.

<sup>7</sup> Thomas W. Higginson, *Margaret Fuller Ossoli, American Men of Letters Series* (1899), Chapters III-VI; Wade, *Margaret Fuller*, Chapters I-V.

<sup>8</sup> Poe seems to have felt early that he must cultivate the New England group if he was to succeed in the literary world. He sent in his card with his first book—by a *Bostonian*. But the gentlemen and ladies of Boston, Cambridge, and Concord were not at home—and Poe soon invented the word "Frogpondians."

<sup>9</sup> Quinn, *op. cit.*, Chap. XI.

<sup>10</sup> *The Flowering of New England*, p. 189.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 273. Ware, of course, knew Margaret Fuller, though probably best when she was a child. He was thirteen years older than she. Though he was not a native of Cambridge, he went to Harvard, taking his degree there in 1816—Miss Fuller was only six years old then. He married a Cambridge girl, Mary, daughter of Dr. Benjamin Waterhouse, a highly respected but rather dreamy physician of the town. He and Margaret Fuller must have met on occasions through the years, and Ware must have known enough about her to put her in a book if he had wished to. For a short biography of Ware, see the *Cyclopaedia of American Literature* (1856), II, 174-75.

The opening paragraphs of "How to Write a Blackwood Article" remain unaltered in the two printings that followed its 1838 publication. Poe begins his skit with an acrid study of Miss Psyche Zenobia, the silly, conceited, over-bookish "blue stocking" heroine. The lady speaks:

I presume everybody has heard of me. My name is the Signora Psyche Zenobia. This I know to be a fact. Nobody but my enemies ever calls me Suky Snobbs. I have been assured that Suky is but a vulgar corruption of Psyche, which is good Greek, and means "the soul" (that's me, I'm *all* soul) and sometimes "a butterfly," which latter meaning undoubtedly alludes to my appearance in my new crimson satin dress, with the sky-blue Arabian *mantelet*, and the trimmings of green *agraffas*, and the seven flounces of orange-colored *ariculas*. . . . Where was I? Ah! I have been assured that Snobbs is a mere corruption of Zenobia, and that Zenobia was a queen—(So am I. Dr. Moneypenny calls me the Queen of Hearts)—and that Zenobia, as well as Psyche, is good Greek, and that my father was "a Greek," and that consequently I have a right to our patronymic, which is Zenobia. . . . I am the Signora Psyche Zenobia.

As I said before, everybody has heard of me. I am that very Signora Psyche Zenobia, so justly celebrated as corresponding secretary to the "*Philadelphia, Regular, Exchange, Tea, Total, Young, Belles, Lettres, Universal, Experimental, Bibliographical, Association, To, Civilize, Humanity*." Dr. Moneypenny made the title for us. . . . At any rate we always add to our names the initials P.R.E.T.T.Y.B.L.U.E.B.A.T.C.H.— . . . one letter for each word.

Notwithstanding the good offices of the Doctor, and the strenuous exertions of the association to get itself into notice, it met with no very great success until I joined it. The truth is, members indulged in too flippant a tone of discussion. The papers read every Saturday evening were characterized less by depth than buffoonery. . . . No profundity, no reading, no metaphysics—nothing which the learned call spirituality, and which the unlearned choose to stigmatise as cant. (Dr. M. says I ought to spell "cant" with a capital K. . . .)

The model for this portrait, distorted as she may appear, could have been recognized by anyone. Margaret Fuller was "school'd by her father from the age of six in the Greek and Roman classics, nurtured by much reading on her own in English, German, and Italian literature."<sup>12</sup> Poe has accented the worst that such an education can do to a woman. The phrase "my father was a Greek" may point to Timothy Fuller, but more likely hints at Bronson Alcott, in whose Temple School Margaret Fuller was teaching in 1837, the year before Poe's tale was published. Alcott was "the mystic of the movement, who drew his inspiration from the Greek and Roman philosophers. He lived for discussion."<sup>13</sup> (He perhaps appears later in "A Predicament" as Dr. Ollapod—Dr. Morpheus in the 1840 edition.) Dr. M. is surely 'Merson. Apparently his importance to the "Association" is further recognized in the final 1845 printing. There each tale bears a motto. "How to Write a Blackwood Article" is given the *Cry of the Turkish Fruit Peddler*: "In the name of the prophet, figs!!" Emerson in "The American Scholar" (1837), it may be recalled, quotes an Eastern proverb: "A fig tree, looking on a fig tree, becometh fruitful."

<sup>12</sup> Wade, *Writings of Margaret Fuller*, p. 221.

<sup>13</sup> Wade, *Margaret Fuller*, p. 62.



The motto for "A Predicament" is from *Comus*, and is clearly enough a slap at Miss Fuller: "What chance, good lady, hath bereft you thus?"

It is easy to see Margaret Fuller as "corresponding secretary" of the P.R.E.T.T.Y.B.L.U.E.B.A.T.C.H. "Apart from every word she wrote," Thomas W. Higginson says, she "will always be an important figure in American history, for this plain reason: that she was the organizer and executive force of the first thoroughly American enterprise . . . 'Transcendentalism.'" <sup>14</sup> She was a "blue stocking" to many, and she was free with "Greek" and "profundity" and "reading" and "metaphysics." The name *Psyche* and the statement "I'm all soul" must be a shot at Emerson's concept of Unity. <sup>15</sup> The *cant* that should be spelled with a capital K is, of course, Kant. The other name for *Psyche*, "'a butterfly,' which latter meaning undoubtedly alludes to my appearance in my new crimson satin dress," probably refers to Margaret Fuller's well-known love of fine raiment. A letter from one of the Circle to a friend in unenlightened New Haven describes one of the Boston Conversations: "Margaret, beautifully dressed (don't despise that, for it made a fine picture), presided with more dignity and grace than I had thought possible." <sup>16</sup> Such a worldly attitude brought forth much criticism, the most famous being Harriet Martineau's label for Margaret and her Circle—the "gorgeous pedants." <sup>17</sup> Her "queenliness" is a constantly reiterated characteristic of her make-up, running through all her biographies. It was even a girlhood trait: Timothy Fuller watching his daughter walking in the garden said to his younger child Ellen: "*Incendo regina*." <sup>18</sup> Poe in having Miss Psyche say "Zenobia was a queen" is merely repeating current gossip—and possibly tying it up with William Ware's popular novel of the year before.

After Miss Psyche goes fully into her successes with the "Association," she calls on Mr. Blackwood, and this gentleman sees in the lady an excellent prospective writer for his magazine. A passage from the *Museum* (1838) reads as follows:

A little reading of *The Sorrows of Werter* will carry you a great way. If you know any big words this is your chance for them. Talk of the academy and the lyceum, and say something about the Ionic and Italic schools, or about Bossarion, and Kant, and Schelling, and Fichte, and be sure you abuse a man called Locke, and bring in the words *a priori* and *a posteriori*. <sup>19</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Margaret Fuller Ossoli, p. 130.

<sup>15</sup> Though "The Over-Soul" was not in print until 1841, Emerson's Platonic concept of Unity appeared in the early lectures and in such works as *Nature* (1836) and "The Divinity School Address" (July 15, 1838).

<sup>16</sup> Wade, *Margaret Fuller*, p. 71.

<sup>17</sup> Higginson, *op. cit.*, pp. 126-27.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 31.

<sup>19</sup> *American Museum of Literature and the Arts* (Baltimore), November, 1838, p. 305.



In the *Broadway Journal* (1845) this thought has been considerably enlarged upon:

If you know any big words this is your chance for them. Talk of the Ionic and Eleatic schools—of Archytas, Gorgias and Alcmaeon. Say something about subjectivity and objectivity. Be sure and abuse a man called Locke. Turn up your nose at things in general, and when you let slip anything a little too absurd, you need not be at the trouble of scratching it out, but just add a foot-note, and say that you are indebted for the above profound observation to the *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* or to the *Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Naturwissenschaft*. This will look erudite and—and—frank.

There are various other tones of equal celebrity, but I shall mention only two more—the tone transcendental and the tone heterogeneous. In the former the merit consists in seeing into the nature of affairs a great deal farther than any body else. This second sight is very efficient when properly managed. A little reading of the "Dial" will carry you a great way. Eschew, in this case, big words; get them as small as possible, and write them upside down. Look over Channing's poems and quote what he says about a "fat little man with a delusive show of Can." Put in something about the Supernal Oneness. Don't say a syllable about the Infernal Twoness.<sup>20</sup>

What has happened between 1838 and 1845 to make this last version more personal and bitter than the first? In the years between, the Transcendental movement flourished and Margaret Fuller came into national recognition. In 1839 she began her famous *Conversations* in Boston and Cambridge, and in the same year she published her translation from the German, *Eckermann's Conversations with Goethe*, followed in 1842 by *Correspondence of Fraulein Gunderode with Bettina von Arnim*.<sup>21</sup> The Brook Farm experiment was launched in April, 1841, and in 1841 also appeared Emerson's *Essays, First Series*. In 1840 the *Dial* began publication, with Miss Fuller as its first editor. In February, 1845, five months before the last publication of the satires during Poe's lifetime, an important book was in print, *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*, and was reviewed by Poe as a work "few women in the country could have written, and no woman in the country would have published, with the exception of Miss Fuller."<sup>22</sup>

Poe's vindictive thrust at poor Ellery Channing toward the end of the selection quoted above must have been the result rather of a distaste for Transcendentalists in general than a case of critical horrors over the work of a minor poet. Channing was vulnerable because of his connections. For the second number of the *Dial*, October, 1840, Emerson composed an article called "New Poetry." This piece included a dozen of Channing's poems, on which Emerson made comment, praising them warmly though recognizing their shortcomings.<sup>23</sup> Higginson states that this article was received "with mingled admiration and rage by the critics, and with special wrath by Poe."<sup>24</sup> When

<sup>20</sup> *Broadway Journal*, Vol. II, No. 1, p. 2 (July 12, 1845).

<sup>21</sup> Wade, *Writings of Margaret Fuller*, p. xi.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 107.

<sup>23</sup> G. W. Cooke, *An Historical and Biographical Introduction to Accompany the Dial*, Rowfant Club (Cleveland, 1902), II, 75.

<sup>24</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 156.

Channing's first book of poetry, *Poems*, was published in 1845, Poe reviewed the volume for *Graham's*, in August of that year. The work deserved neither the bitterness of Poe's attack nor the space devoted to it in the magazine. It is a minor Wordsworth-inspired effusion, harmless and pleasant if sleepy reading. But Channing was a victim of circumstance: Margaret Fuller was by now his sister-in-law, and she and Emerson had declared themselves his literary godparents. Poe writes in his review:

His book contains 63 things, which he calls poems, and which he no doubt seriously supposes so to be. . . . At page 39, while indulging in . . . bursts of fervor and of indignation, he says:

Thou meetest a common man

With a delusive show of *can*,

and this passage we quote by way of instancing what we consider the only misprint in the book; . . . for what is a delusive show of *can*? No doubt it should have been,

Thou meetest a little pup

With a delusive show of *tin-cup*.

And this remarkable volume is, after all, by William Ellery Channing . . . what critic so bold as not to pronounce it more luminous than the logic of Emerson and more profound than the Orphicism of Alcott.<sup>28</sup>

But to return to the paragraph itself: Poe appears to have enlarged his 1838 version of the passage to fit the more extensive scene that the Transcendentalists had set up in the seven years between. His talents for satire have developed strength. "Put in something about the Supernal Oneness. Don't say a syllable about the Infernal Twoness" is a first-rate dig at the Circle. The older version sounds flat after reading the last.

The titles of the tales and their changes through the years are a puzzling matter. Transcendentalism is after all a minor diversion only, in the major satire against *Blackwood's*; and yet Poe at first gives a name to the introductory story which points directly to the Boston group. "The Psyche Zenobia" (1838) and "The Signora Zenobia" (1840) look toward Emerson and Margaret Fuller. *Psyche* means *soul*, and Miss Psyche is *all soul*; Zenobia was a queen, and Miss Fuller was being called one at that time. Another source for the first title of this introductory tale, as well as the name of its heroine, intrudes here: Higginson mentions a number of English magazines that were being read by members of the Transcendental Club, and one of them is called *Psyche*.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>28</sup> *Complete Works*, XI, 178-79. Poe is still growling in March, 1844, this time at Margaret Fuller for having selected from "the list of American poets, Cornelius Matthews and William Ellery Channing, for special commendation. . . . Mr. Matthews once wrote some sonnets 'On Man,' and Mr. Channing some lines on 'A Tin Can,' or something of the kind." *Complete Works*, XIII, 169-70. These lines that so nettled Poe may be read in Channing's *Poems* of 1845 in a group of poetic aphorisms called "Thoughts."

<sup>29</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 146.

"The Scythe of Time" (1838 and 1840) has, as far as can be seen, no satirical meaning at all, though it fits well the tale that follows. It has another interest, however: the motto the tale bears, as has been stated, comes from *Comus*. No one appears to have noted that the title is likewise Milton's, from *Paradise Lost*:

. . . and whatever thing  
The scythe of Time mows down, devour unspar'd.<sup>27</sup>

But why, for the projected but never published *Phantasy Pieces* of 1842 did Poe change the names of the tales to "How to Write a Blackwood Article," an informative yet ugly title, and "A Predicament," which is certainly inferior to the more imaginative "The Scythe of Time"? One guess is as good as another, but perhaps his first interest was to fool the public into believing that here were new stories. It is a strange thing, too, that he should have erased any reference to the Transcendentalists from the title of the first tale, and yet lengthened his satire against them within the body of the work. It appears that, although the titles were changed in 1842, the stories were not revised until their 1845 printing in the *Journal*, after Margaret Fuller had risen to eminence and was crowding Poe as a critic.

*A Fable for Critics* (1848) was in print three years, and *The Blithedale Romance* (1852) seven years, after Poe's tales were last revised for the *Broadway Journal*, July 12, 1845. Lowell and Hawthorne could hardly have failed to read the satires at this time, if they had not read them in earlier printings. In 1845 Poe was very much before the public eye, for in January of that year he had made a sensational success with "The Raven," published in Willis' *Evening Mirror* just before he joined the staff of the *Journal*. Furthermore, the newly married Lowell and his wife both contributed poetry during the first half of the year to the *Broadway Journal*. Lowell writes on January 17 to Charles F. Briggs, a friend and editor of the publication: "Maria and I . . . like the *Journal* exceedingly."<sup>28</sup> By March 17, however, their opinion changed, for they did not approve of the Longfellow controversy that Poe had brought over with him from the *Mirror*. Mrs. Lowell writes to her sister-in-law: "We are greatly disappointed in the *Broadway Journal*."<sup>29</sup> In July, when Briggs resigned and Poe and Henry C. Watson became chief editors, the contributions of the Lowells ceased. One can only surmise what their thoughts were when Poe's satires against Margaret Fuller appeared in the issue of July 12, but at least it may be assumed that they read them.

Emerson was actually the only one of the "mystics" of whom Lowell approved;<sup>30</sup> and Hawthorne had lost his money and his patience at

<sup>27</sup> Book X, line 606.

<sup>28</sup> Hope Jillison Vernon, "The Life of Maria (White) Lowell," *Poems of Maria Lowell* (Providence, 1936), p. 26.

<sup>29</sup> *Idem*.

<sup>30</sup> Richard Croom Beatty, *James Russell Lowell* (Nashville, 1942), p. 96.

Brook Farm. Neither Hawthorne nor Lowell, however, was seemingly at outs with Margaret Fuller just then, and they must have felt, for various reasons, that Poe dealt too harshly with her. Lowell's wife, the former Maria White and one of the "gorgeous pedants" of the Conversations in Boston, must have been indignant. Hawthorne of course had written with much irony in 1841 of a certain Transcendental Heifer; but in 1842 he married Sophia Peabody, a dear friend of Margaret Fuller, and by 1845, to all appearances at least, he and Miss Fuller were pleasantly disposed toward each other.<sup>31</sup>

In 1846 Lowell suffered a devastating blow at Miss Fuller's hands. She declared in her *Papers on Literature and Art* that his "verse is stereotyped; his thought sounds no depth; and posterity will not remember him."<sup>32</sup> Such criticism stirred him to anger, and evidently distressed Mrs. Lowell as well. He writes Briggs, relative to including Margaret Fuller in the *Fable*: "She is a very foolish, conceited woman, who has got together a great deal of information, but not enough *knowledge* to save her from being ill-tempered. Even Maria thinks I ought to give her a line or two."<sup>33</sup>

Though the reputations and eccentricities of Margaret Fuller and other Transcendentalists were so well known that they offered a common source for anybody's satire, there is enough similarity in the handling of these characters by Poe and Lowell to make one suspect that somewhat of the satire in "How to Write a Blackwood Article" and "A Predicament" found its way into *A Fable for Critics*.<sup>34</sup>

Miranda of the *Fable* bears a close resemblance to Miss Psyche Zenobia. They are both full of egotism:

She always keeps asking if I don't observe a  
Particular likeness 'twixt her and Minerva (p. 82).  
For a woman must surely see well if she try,  
The whole of whose being's a capital I (p. 82).

Lowell, too, makes fun of the "gorgeous pedant":

*Apropos* of Miranda, I'll rest on my oars  
And drift through a trifling digression on bores,

<sup>31</sup> Wade, *Margaret Fuller*, pp. 108-09. For an ingenious but rather illogical interpretation of Hawthorne's strange later treatment of Margaret Fuller, see Oscar Cargill, "Nemesis and Nathaniel Hawthorne," *PMLA*, LII (September, 1937), 848-62, and two replies to the article: Austin Warren, "Hawthorne, Margaret Fuller, and 'Nemesis,'" *PMLA*, LIV (June, 1939), 615-18, and William Pierce Randel, "Hawthorne, Channing, and Margaret Fuller," *Am. Lit.*, X (January, 1939), 472-76.

<sup>32</sup> Wade, *Writings of Margaret Fuller*, p. 366.

<sup>33</sup> Beatty, *op. cit.*, p. 98. Such words remind one of Poe: "In a word she is an ill-tempered and very inconsistent Old Maid—avoid her." *Complete Works*, XVII, 290. "Miss Fuller, that detestable old maid—told him [Lowell] once, that he was 'so wretched a poet as to be disgusting even to his best friends.' This set him off at a tangent, and he has never been quite right since." *Ibid*, XVII, 333.

<sup>34</sup> References that follow are to *Complete Writings of James Russell Lowell*, Elmwood Edition (1910), Vol. XII.

For not wearing ear-rings in *more majorum*  
Our ears are kept bored just as if we still wore 'em (p. 64).

Miss Fuller's absorption in Emerson's Over-Soul is likewise accented:

Here Miranda came up, and said, "Phoebus! you know  
That the Infinite Soul has its infinite woe,  
As I ought to know, having lived cheek-by-jowl,  
Since the day I was born, with the Infinite Soul" (p. 63).

In his sketch of Emerson for the *Fable*, Lowell again follows a lead suggested in the earlier satires. Poe calls Emerson Dr. M, or Dr. Moneypenny. Lowell is also interested in the "money" side of Emerson's nature:

A Greek on right Yankee shoulders, whose range  
Has Olympus for one pole, for t'other the Exchange (p. 38).

Poe's talkative bore, probably Bronson Alcott, is Dr. Ollapod (Dr. Morpheus in the 1840 edition):

The eternal *click-clack, click-clack, click-clack*, of the clock was the most melodious of music in my ears, and occasionally put me in mind of the grateful sermonic harangues of Dr. Ollapod.<sup>35</sup>

Lowell gives Alcott

... a snug room at Plato's when night comes to walk to,  
And people from morning till midnight to talk to (p. 41).

The connection between *The Blithedale Romance* (1852) and Poe's satires is an involved one. Hawthorne had very likely read William Ware's *Zenobia*, as Poe must have read it before him. On May 2, 1852, he writes the critic Edwin Percy Whipple for help in choosing a title for his novel:

"The Blithedale Romance"—that would do, in lack of a better. . . . 'Zenobia'—Mr. Ware has anticipated me in this."<sup>36</sup>

But Poe had read Margaret Fuller into Ware's book, not drawn her out of it; and it is unlikely that Hawthorne would have seen any likenesses between Miss Fuller and Queen Zenobia at all had he not read Poe first. As soon as he was halfway through the satires, however, it can hardly be doubted that he caught the point and recognized the source. The only conclusion, then, is that Hawthorne knew both Ware and Poe—that he recognized Poe's source in Ware, and took from Poe the notion of presenting Margaret Fuller under the guise of Ware's Queen Zenobia.

That he should have approved of Poe's satires to the extent of borrowing a central idea from them is harder to forgive than it is to believe. Poe's caricature is too bitter for a man with a conscience—even of the New England variety—to have had anything to do with.

<sup>35</sup> *Broadway Journal*, July 12, 1845, p. 6.

<sup>36</sup> *American Notebooks*, ed. Randall Stewart (New Haven, 1932), p. 309.

Five years after the last revision of Poe's tales Margaret Fuller died—most tragically; and two years after her death *The Blithedale Romance* appeared in the book shops. Though for fiction's sake Hawthorne had made his heroine beautiful and charming, and even superb, there was enough of harshness in the portrait to distress Margaret Fuller's friends and make them deny that she is the book at all.<sup>37</sup>

Though she was for a time closely associated with Hawthorne, she was sensible enough to realize that he never wholeheartedly accepted her as a friend:

I feel like a sister to H., or rather more that he might be a brother to me, than ever with any man before. Yet with him it is, though sweet, not deep kindred; at least, not deep as yet.<sup>38</sup>

She guessed right, but whatever it was that he did not like about her he never very clearly said. Perhaps Miss Margaret Bell's suggestion is correct: that he may have been jealous of her successes, and of his wife's devotion to her.<sup>39</sup> There must be here, too, somewhat of the nineteenth-century disapproval of the "blue stocking"; and obviously her Italian years shocked him. Certainly he ought never to have written in his *Italian Notebooks* the pitifully blind and untrue account of her marriage and last days that Julian Hawthorne saw fit to send to the press in 1884;<sup>40</sup> and he should not have begun *The Blithedale Romance* within little over a year after Margaret Fuller Ossoli was drowned at sea.<sup>41</sup> "Zenobia was a queen," says Poe. "Zenobia! Queen Zenobia!" says Hawthorne. "Here is one of your vassals lurking in the wood."<sup>42</sup> It is a shame, I say, that both these men are writing in irony. But one is tempted to forgive Poe first.

This paper has found a wholly satisfactory solution to at least one of the problems it set out to investigate: Margaret Fuller is the Psyche Zenobia of Poe's satires. Miss Psyche has an abundance of Miss Fuller's worst characteristics, she is secretary to the "Association," and she is placed in the familiar Transcendental setting. Thus is added to the three well-known satires on Miss Fuller a new one, and probably the first; and Poe takes his place beside Lowell, Hawthorne, and

<sup>37</sup> Wade, *Margaret Fuller*, pp. 114-115. Higginson says, "Zenobia in Hawthorne's *Blithedale Romance* has scarcely a trait in common with Margaret Fuller." *Op. cit.*, p. 173. Julian Hawthorne, in the life of his parents, coyly tries to keep people guessing: "Were, or were not, Zenobia and Margaret Fuller one and the same person? . . . although I am in possession of indubitable evidence . . . I shall . . . forbear to say the word." *Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife*, Standard Library (1884), I, 392. Milton Wade sets down what everybody thinks, and probably always did think: "No other woman of Hawthorne's acquaintance but Margaret Fuller could have supplied the original of Zenobia." *Margaret Fuller*, p. 117.

<sup>38</sup> Wade, *Margaret Fuller*, p. 113.

<sup>39</sup> *Margaret Fuller* (New York, 1930), p. 121.

<sup>40</sup> Wade, *Margaret Fuller*, p. 380.

<sup>41</sup> "Introductory Note," *The Blithedale Romance*, Standard Library, V, 315.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, V, 559.

Holmes, whose *Elsie Venner* (1861) came late and was not discussed here.

But is Lowell's Miranda at all a copy of Poe's Zenobia? and what is the connection between Poe's heroine and Hawthorne's Zenobia of *The Blithedale Romance*? This second problem of two parts can never be answered as positively as the first; and yet it must be granted that the small internal evidence we have indicates that both Lowell and Hawthorne followed Poe's lead. It may be added that external evidence—literary friendships, quarrels, personalities, and dates relative to the authors and their works—points even more directly to such a conclusion.

*University of Alabama*



# A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF CRITICAL ARTHURIAN LITERATURE FOR THE YEAR 1949

*Prepared by*

JOHN J. PARRY\*

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>ADA</i>	Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum
<i>Archiv</i>	Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen
<i>BBCS</i>	Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies
<i>BBSIA</i>	Bulletin Bibliographique de la Société Internationale <b>Arthurienne</b>
<i>Bull. Hisp.</i>	Bulletin Hispanique
<i>Cult. Neolat.</i>	Cultura Neolatina
<i>Deu. Viertel.</i>	Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte
<i>DLZ</i>	Deutsche Literaturzeitung
<i>GIF</i>	Giornale Italiano di Filologia
<i>GSLI</i>	Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana
<i>Hisp. Rev.</i>	Hispanic Review
<i>JEGP</i>	Journal of English and Germanic Philology
<i>Let. Rom.</i>	Les Lettres Romanes
<i>Lond. Med. St.</i>	London Mediaeval Studies
<i>LTLS</i>	London Times Literary Supplement
<i>MA</i>	Moyen Age
<i>Med. Æv.</i>	Medium Ævum
<i>Mélanges</i>	Mélanges de philologie romane et de littérature médiévale offerts à Ernest Hœpffner . . . par ses élèves et ses amis. (Publ. de la Fac. des Lettres de l'Univ. de Strasbourg, 113.) Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1949
<i>Hœpffner</i>	
<i>MLJ</i>	Modern Language Journal
<i>MLN</i>	Modern Language Notes
<i>MLQ</i>	Modern Language Quarterly

\*The appearance of the new bibliography of the International Arthurian Society (see item 3093), covering much the same ground as this but in a rather different fashion, seems to call for a restatement of the principles governing this one. My aim is to cover the whole field of the Arthurian story—critical studies, texts, and translations—from its beginnings to the present day. I include also related subjects such as Romano-British history and the Troubadours, which furnish a background for fields in which I am particularly interested. Each annual list covers the preceding calendar year, with the addition of items overlooked in previous years. Reviews appearing after the end of the year may be included if the works reviewed are already in the list; otherwise they are carried over to the following year. For the period covered I omit nothing known to me except minor book notices when longer reviews are available. Where possible I have examined each item, but many references have to be given at second hand and are incomplete, or are to works (like 3043b last year) that are not critical and so should not have been included. This is a preliminary list, designed to furnish as quickly as possible clues for workers in the field, rather than a finished critical bibliography of the subject.

MLR	Modern Language Review
MP	Modern Philology
Neophil.	Neophilologus
NLW Journ.	National Library of Wales Journal
N&Q	Notes and Queries
PBSA	Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America
Philologica	Malone Anniversary Studies. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1949
PMLA	Publications of the Modern Language Association of America
PQ	Philological Quarterly
RES	Review of English Studies
RESNS	Review of English Studies, new series
Rev. Belge	Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire
RF	Romanische Forschungen
RFE	Revista de Filología Española
RHE	Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique
RLC	Revue de Littérature Comparée
RLR	Revue des Langues Romanes
RMAL	Revue du Moyen Âge Latin
Rom.	Romania
Rom. Phil.	Romance Philology
Studia Neophil.	Studia Neophilologica
THSC	Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion
TNTL	Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde
ZDPb	Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie
ZRPb	Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie

3056. Ackerman, Robert W. *List of Members of the Comparative Literature III (Arthurian Romance) Section of the Modern Language Association*. Mimeographed. Stanford University, 1949.

3057. ———. "[American] Bibliography for 1948." *BBSIA*, 1 (1949), 11-19.

3058. Adkins, Nelson F. "Emerson and the Bardic Tradition." (*Vulgate Merlin*.) *PMLA*, LXIII (1948), 662-677.

3059. Albert, Peter P. *Die Gralsburg Wildenberg im Odenwald und die historische Kritik*. (Comment on 528, A. Schreiber, *Neue Bausteine*, 1922.) Printed as manuscript. Buchen, 1949.

3059a. Arnold, Ivor, and Henry Lucas. "Le Personnage de Gormont dans la Chanson de Gormont et Isembart." (Includes Geoffrey, Wace, Layamon, *Brut Tysilio*.) *Mélanges Hæpffner*, pp. 215-226.

3060. Atabay, Ercüment. "Büyük İngiliz Destanları [The Great English Epics]." *Morte D'Arthur. Yenitürk*, 1x (1941), 706-709; *Faerie Queene*, *ibid.*, x (1942), 6-9.

2754. Auerbach, Erich. *Mimesis*. 1946.

Additional reviews by Helen Adolf in *MLQ*, x (1949), 249-250; by Helmut A. Hatzfeld in *Rom. Phil.*, 11 (1949), 333-338; see also 3106, Gerhard Hess.

3061. Bach, H. *Middelalderens tyske Litteratur*. København: Gyldendal, 1948.

Rev. by Hermann Schneider in *Studia Neophil.*, xx1 (1949), 299-300.

3061a. Bartrum, P. C. "Some Studies in Early Welsh History." (Geoffrey, etc.) *THSC*, 1948 (1949), pp. 279-302.

3062. Basset, André. *Les Troubadours limousins*. Limoges: Rivet, 1949.

3062a. Bataille, Georges. "La Littérature française du moyen âge, la morale chevaleresque et la Passion." *Critique. Revue générale des publications françaises et étrangères*, v, No. 38 (1949), 585-601. Comment on G. Cohen, 3073b.

2837a. Battaglia, A. *Andreas Capellanus*. 1947.

Rev. by G. Vidossi in *GLSI*, cxxvi (1949), 66-67.

3063. Becker, Philip August. "Kyot der Provenzale." *RF*, LVIII-LIX (1947), 323.

3064. ———. "Neues über Chrestien de Troyes." *RF*, LX (1948), 536-545.

3065. Belperron, Pierre. *La Joie d'Amour, contribution à l'étude des Troubadours et de l'amour courtois*. Paris: Plon, 1948.

Rev. by J. Calmette in *Annales du Midi*, LXI (1948), 231; by H. J. Chaytor in *MLR*, XLIV (1949), 414-415; by Jeanne Lods in *Rom.*, LXXI (1950), 142-143.

3065a. Berry, Francis. "The Sublime Ballet. An Essay on Sir Gawain and the Green Knight." *Wind and the Rain*, Winter, 1949-50, pp. 165-174.

2758. Bezzola, Reto R. *Les Origines . . . de la littérature courtoise*. 1944.

Rev. in *LTLS*, January 6, 1950, p. 13; by Giuseppe Chiri in *Cult. Neolat.*, VIII (1948), 119-126.

2838. ———. *Le Sens de l'aventure et de l'amour*. 1947. (Chrétien de Troyes.)

Rev. by M. Delbouille in *Erasmus*, II (1949), 406-409; by C. Guerrieri Crocetti in *GIF*, II (1949), 94-95; by K. Sneyders de Vogel in *Museum*, LIV (1949), 243-244; see also 3160, Aurelio Roncaglia.

3066. Bigi, Emilio. *La Poesia di Boiardo*. Firenze: Sansoni, 1941. (Studi di lettere, storia, e filosofia, pubbl. dalla R. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, xx.)

2940. Binni, Walter. *Metodo e poesia di Ludovico Ariosto*. 1947.

Rev. by E. Bonora in *Belfagor*, III (1948).

3067. Bizet, J. A. *Suso et le Minnesang, ou la morale de l'amour courtois*. Paris: Aubier [1949?]

2941. Blair, Peter Hunter. "The Origins of Northumbria." (The Gildas tradition; the veracity of Gildas.) Reprinted from *Archaeologia Aeliana*, xxv (1947), 1-51.

3068. Blenner-Hassett, Roland. "Geoffrey of Monmouth and Milton's *Comus*." *MLN*, LXIV (1949), 315-318; reprinted with only minor changes in *Studia Neophil.*, XXI (1949), 216-221.

3069. ———. "Two Old-Norse Motifs in Lawman's *Brut*." *Studia Neophil.*, xxi (1949), 211-215.

3070. Bohigas, P. (editor). *Tractats de cavalleria*. (Colección "Els Nostres Clàssics," Serie A, Vol. 57.) Barcelona: Editorial Barcino, 1947.

Rev. by M. de Riquer in *RFE*, xxxi (1947), 241-244.

Bork, Hans. See 1829, Konrad Burdach.

2762. Briffault, Robert. *Les Troubadours et le sentiment romanesque*. 1945.

Rev. by E. R. Curtius in *RF*, lx (1948), 598.

2379. Brugger, E. "'Der schöne Feigling' in der arthurischen Literatur." Another installment (III, b, iv) in *ZRPh*, lxv (1949), 121-192; completed (V, a), *ibid.*, 289-433.

2444a. Brunel, Clovis. *Jaufré, roman arthurienne*. 1943.

Rev. by M. de Riquer in *RFE*, xxxi (1947), 245-247.

1829. Burdach, Konrad. *Der Graal*. 1938. (Edited by Hans Bork.)

Rev. by Friedrich Ranke in *ADA*, lxiv (1948), 20-24.

Casella, Mario. See 3137, Bruno Nardi.

3071. Casson, L. F. *The Romance of Sir Degrevant. A Parallel Text Edition*. Oxford: University Press (for E.E.T.S.), 1949.

Rev. in *LTLS*, September 2, 1949, p. 566.

3072. Charlesworth, M. P. *The Lost Province*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1949.

Rev. in *LTLS*, December 23, 1949, p. 845.

3073. Clark, John W. "Observations on Certain Differences in Vocabulary between *Cleanness* and *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*." *PQ*, xxviii (1949), 261-273.

3073a. ———. "The Authorship of 'Sir Gawain and the Green Knight,' 'Pearl,' 'Cleanness,' 'Patience,' and 'Erkenwald' in the Light of the Vocabulary." *Summaries of Ph.D. Theses*, University of Minnesota, iv (1949), 102-112.

2547. Closs, August. *Tristan und Isolt*. Second edition. 1947.

Rev. by Carroll E. Reed in *MLQ*, x (1949), 252; by A. Moret in *Etudes germaniques*, iii (1948), 421.

860. Cohen, Gustave. *Chrétien de Troyes et son œuvre*. New edition. 1948. See 3166, P. F. Schurmann.

3073b. ———. *Histoire de la Chevalerie en France au Moyen Age*. Paris (?): Richard-Masse, 1949.

See 3062a, Georges Bataille.

Conde, Justina Ruiz de. See Ruiz de Conde, Justina.

Crocetti, Camillo Guerrieri. See Guerrieri Crocetti, Camillo.

3074. Cross, Tom Peete. "Celtic Mythology and Arthurian Romance." (Comment on 3020a, O'Rahilly.) *Philologica*, pp. 110-114.

3074a. Curtius, Ernest Robert. *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter*. Bern: Francke, 1948.

Rev. by Walter Naumann in *German Books*, II (1949), 153-154; by John Orr in *MLR*, XLIV (1949), 570-571; by R. Minder in *RLC*, XXIV (1949), 426; by Erich Auerbach in *MLN*, LXV (1950), 348-351; by Edmond Faral in *Rom.*, LXXI (1950), 113-115; by Paul Zumthor in *Neophil.*, XXXIV (1950), 60-61; see also 3093b, Herbert Frenzel.

3075. Davies, M. B. "The Celtic Twilight (A Note)." (Geoffrey of Monmouth; *Dream of Rhonabwy*.) *Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, Fouad I University*, VIII (1946), 13-25.

2855. Denomy, Alexander J. *The Heresy of Courtly Love*. 1947.

Additional rev. by J. Lods in *Rom.*, LXX (1948-49), 554-555; brief note by L. Delaisse in *Scriptorium*, II (1948), 303.

3076. ———. "Jovens: the Notion of Youth among the Troubadours, its Meaning and Source." *Mediaeval Studies*, XI (1949), 1-22.

2773. Dillon, Myles. *The Cycles of the Kings*. 1946.

Additional rev. by E. G. Quin in *Irish Hist. St.*, VI (1948), 162; by Kenneth Jackson in *Speculum*, XXIII (1948), 119-121; by K. M[alone] in *MLN*, LXIV (1949), 214; by Tom Peete Cross in *MP*, XLVI (1949), 273.

3076a. 9(=Dokuz) Eylül, Sevinç. "Kral Arthur Efsanesi [The Legend of King Arthur]." *Istanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınlarından* [Publication of the Faculty of Letters, Istanbul University], No. 237; *İngiliz Edebiyatı Tarihi Zümresi Dergi* [Department of English Journal], I (1944), 36-62.

3077. Donahue, Mary Joan. "The Revision of Tennyson's Sir Galahad." *PQ*, XXVIII (1949), 326-329.

3078. Dopp, Herman. "Le Chevalier au Cygne et Godefroid de Bouillon." (Lohengrin.) *Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, Fouad I University*, III (1935), 148-162.

3079. Doutenville, Henri. *La Mythologie française*. (Includes Morgan la Fée.) Paris: Payot, 1948.

3080. Dowdey, P. J. "Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight, I. 620, I. 625." *MLR*, XLIV (1949), 229.

3081. Draak, A. M. E. "Hollande. Bibliographie pour 1940-1948." *BBSIA*, I (1949), 46-48.

3082. Dubs, Ingeborg. *Galeran de Bretagne. Die Krise im französischen höfischen Roman*. (Studiorum Romanicorum Collectio Turicensis, Vol. III.) Bern: Francke, 1949.

3082a. Eagan, Joseph F. "The Import of Color Symbolism in Sir Gawain and the Green Knight." *St. Louis University Studies*, I (1949), 11-86.

2775. Edelman, Nathan. *Attitudes . . . toward the Middle Ages*. 1946.

Additional revs. by André Bruyere in *Let. Rom.*, III (1949), 240-242; by I.D.O.A. in *Med. Æv.*, XVIII (1949), 80-81; by K. S. de V. in *Museum*, LIV (1949), 244-245.

**XX.** *Les Editions de la Table Ronde* are not Arthurian. See *RHE*, XLIV (1949), 328-329.

3083. Eis, Gerhard. "Ein neues Rennewart-Fragment." *ZDPPh*, LXX (1947-48), 145-169.

3084. ———. *Mittelhochdeutsche Lieder und Sprüche*. (Includes Minnesang.) (Germanistische Bücherei, Band 2.) München: Max Hueber Verlag (1949?).

Emond, V. See 3098, P. Groult.

2551. Errante, Guido. *Sulla Lirica romanze delle origine*. 1943.

Rev. by Silvio Pellegrini in *Cult. Neolat.*, VIII (1948), 126-128.

3084a. ———. "Marcabru e le fonti sacre dell' antica lirica romanza." Firenze: Sansoni, 1948.

Rev. by Alberto del Monte in *GIF*, II (1949), 281-285.

3084b. Falc'hun, F. "L'Auteur de 'Barzaz-Breiz.'" *Annales de Bretagne*, LVI (1949), 76-92.

3085. Fergusson, Francis. "Tristan und Isolde: The Action and Theater of Passion." (Wagner.) Chapter III in *The Idea of a Theater*. Princeton: University Press, 1949.

3086. Fischer, Walther P. "King Lear at Tuebingen: Johannes Naucerus and Geoffrey of Monmouth." *Philologica*, pp. 208-227.

3087. Flutre, L.-F. "Etudes sur le Roman de Perceforêt." *Rom.*, LXX (1948-49), 474-522; to be continued.

3088. Foerster, Lillian E. "Tristan in the Flesh." *Opera News*, xiv, 7 (December 12, 1949), 6-11.

2967. Foulet, L. (translator). *Chrétien de Troyes. Perceval le Gallois*. 1947.

Rev. by O. Jodogne in *Let. Rom.*, III (1949), 156.

3089. Foulon, C., J. Frappier, and P. Le Gentil. "France et Belgique. Bibliographie pour les années 1939-1948." *BBSIA*, I (1949), 20-38.

3090. Foulon, Charles. "Les Romans arthuriens." *Nouvelle Revue de Bretagne*, 1948, pp. 254-258.

3090a. Fourquet, Jean. "Les Noms propres du Parzival." *Mélanges Hæpffner*, pp. 245-260.

3091. Françon, Marcel. "La Fée Morgain et les 'Chroniques Gargantuines.'" *MLN*, LXIV (1949), 52-53.

3092. ——— (editor). *Le Vray Gargantua, réimprimé d'après l'exemplaire unique de la Bibliothèque Nationale*. (Includes Morgan, Merlin, and Avalon.) Paris: Nizet, 1949.

3093. Frappier, Jean, and others. *Bulletin Bibliographique de la Société Internationale Arthurienne*. No. 1. Paris, 1949.  
See *Speculum*, xxiv (1949), 627.

3093a. Frappier, Jean. "L' 'Institution' de Lancelot dans le *Lancelot en Prose*." *Mélanges Hæpffner*, pp. 269-278.

———. See also 3089, C. Foulon.

3093b. Frenzel, Herbert. "La proposta di E. R. Curtius per una 'storia della Teoria poetica.'" *GIF*, II (1949), 318-328.

3093c. Frings, Th. *Minnesinger und Troubadours*. Berlin: Akad.-Verlag, 1949.

3093d. Fuller, Ronald. "Lord Tennyson's 'Morte d'Arthur.'" *London Calling*, January 6, 1949, p. 19.

3094. Gabrieli, Francesco. *Ibn Hazm: Il collare della colomba sull'amore e gli amanti. Versione dall' arabo*. (Biblioteca di Cultura Moderna, No. 461.) Bari: Laterza, 1949.

Rev. by Emilio García Gómez in *Al-Andalus*, xiv (1949), 231-232.

2621a. Getto, Giovanni. *Studio sul Morgante*. 1944.

Rev. by C. Curto in *GSLI*, cxxvi (1949), 71-78.

2861. Gilson, Etienne. "L'Art d'identifier les auteurs." The correct reference is *RMAL*, III (1947), 60-62.

2862. Gist, Margaret A. *Love and War in the Middle English Romances*. 1947.

Additional rev. by A. Basil Cottle in *RES*, xxv (1949), 351-352.

3095. Goldovsky, Boris. "More Accents upon *Tristan und Isolde*." *Opera News*, xiv, 7 (December 12, 1949), 26-28.

3096. Golther, Wolfgang. *Die Deutsche Dichtung im Mittelalter. 800-1500*. (Band I of *Epochen der deutschen Literatur*.) 3, unveränderte Auflage. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1949.

3097. Graves, Robert. *The White Goddess. A Historical Grammar of Poetic Myth*. London: Faber and Faber, 1949. (Includes Welsh Arthurian poems.)

Rev. in *LTLS*, February 5, 1949, p. 94.

3098. Groult, P., and V. Emond (editors). *Anthologie de la littérature française du moyen âge, des origines à la fin du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*. 2 vols. Gembloux: Duculot, 1948.

Rev. by Raphael Levy in *Rom. Phil.*, III (1949-50), 201-204; by M. Dominica Legge in *MLR*, xlv (1950), 88-89.



3099. Guerrieri Crocetti, Camillo. "Nel Mondo di Chrétien de Troyes. I. 'Erec,' 'Cligès,' 'Lancelot,' 'Yvain.'" *GIF*, 1 (1948), 296-322; "II. 'Perceval.'" *Ibid.*, 11 (1949) 1-21.

3100. Hare, Kenneth. *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight. A Fourteenth Century Poem done into Modern English Verse*. With an introduction, notes, and a bibliography by R. M. Wilson. Second edition. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode [1948].

Rev. by Gerard Murphy in *Studies*, December, 1948, p. 509; by A. Macdonald in *RES*, xxv (1949), 350-351.

3101. Harris, Julian. "The Rôle of the Lion in Chrétien de Troyes' *Yvain*." *PMLA*, LXIV (1949), 1143-1163.

3102. Harvey, John. *The Plantagenets, 1154-1485*. (Includes Geoffrey of Monmouth, Layamon, Brutus Legend.) London: B. T. Batsford, 1948.

Rev. by Beatrice White in *MLR*, XLIV (1949), 104-105.

3103. Hatto, A. T. "On Chrétien and Wolfram." (Comment on 1895, J. Fourquet, *Wolfram*.) *MLR*, XLIV (1949), 380-385.

2308. Heckel, Hermann. *Das ethische Wortfeld in Wolframs Parzival*. 1939.

Rev. by Friedrich Ranke in *ADA*, LXIV (1948), 26-28.

3104. Heinermann, Theodor. "Zu Wolframs *Kyot*." *Archiv*, CLXXV (1948), 130-135.

3105. Hennig, John. "Immermann's 'Tristan und Isolde' and Ireland." *MLR*, XLIV (1949), 246-252.

3106. Hess, Gerhard. "Mimesis. Zu Erich Auerbachs Geschichte des abendländischen Realismus." *RF*, LXI (1948), 173-211. See 2754, Erich Auerbach.

3106a. Hofer, Stefan. "Streitfragen zur altfranzösischen Literatur. I. Die Komposition des Tristanromans." (Eilhart, Béroul, Wace, *Eneas*.) *ZRPh*, LXV (1949), 257-288.

2983. Hole, Christina. *English Folk Heroes*. 1948.

Rev. by H.D. in *RHE*, XLIV (1949), 358-359; by Richard M. Dorson in *Western Folk Lore*, VIII (1949), 288-289.

3107. Holmes, Urban T., Jr. "Further on Marie de France." *Symposium*, III (1949), 335-339.

1949. ———. *A History of Old French Literature*. 1939. A photographic reproduction, with a new appendix, was published in New York by Crofts, 1948.

2872. ———. "A New Interpretation of Chrétien's *Conte del Graal*." 1947. Reprinted, with minor changes and additions, as Vol. VIII of *University of North Carolina Studies in the Romance Languages and Literatures*, Chapel Hill, 1948.

3108. Housman, J. E. "Great Britain. Bibliography 1939-1948." *BBSIA*, I (1949), 39-45.

3109. Hutcheson, W. J. Fraser. "King Arthur, the Strathclyder." *Chambers' Journal*, July, 1947, pp. 433-436.

3109a. Imbs, Paul. "La Journée dans la Queste del Saint Graal et la Morte le Roi Artu." *Mélanges Hæpffner*, pp. 279-293.

3110. Jackson, Kenneth, "Arthur's Battle of Breguion." *Antiquity*, xxiii (1949), 48-49.

2989. Janecke, Robert. *Parzival nach Wolfram von Eschenbach*. 1948.

Rev. by John G. Franks in *MLJ*, xxxiii (1949), 330.

3111. Jones, David. "The Myth of Arthur." Pp. 174-218 in *For Hilaire Belloc: Essays in Honor of his 71st Birthday*. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1942.

3112. ———. "The Arthurian Legend—A Study of the Post-humous Fragment by Charles Williams." *Tablet*, December 25, 1948, pp. 219-221.

3112a. Jones, Francis. "An Approach to Welsh Genealogy." (Nennius, *Bruts*, etc.) *THSC*, 1948 (1949), pp. 303-466.

2994. Jones, Gwyn, and Thomas Jones (translators). *The Mabinogion. A New Translation*. 1948. Reprinted in Everyman's Library. London: Dent, 1949.

Rev. in *LTLS*, August 28, 1948, p. 481; by T. J. Morgan in *Y Llenor*, xxviii (1949), 8-15; by G. E. Evans in *Life and Letters*, February, 1949, pp. 104-110.

3113. Jones, J. J. "The Mabinogion in Czech." (Brief note.) *NLW Journ.*, vi (1949), 182.

3114. Jones, Thomas. *Mân Us*. (Includes *Canu Aneirin*, *Pedair Cainc y Mabinogi*, *Culhwch ac Olwen*.) Caerdydd: Llyfrau'r Castell, 1949.

3115. ———. "Gerald the Welshman's 'Itinerary through Wales' and 'Description of Wales.'" (Influence of Geoffrey of Monmouth, parallels to Nennius.) *NLW Journ.*, vi (1949), 117-148; to be continued.

3116. ———. "Gleif penntirec." (*Kulhwch ac Olwen*.) *BBCS*, xiii (1949), 75-77.

———. See also 2994, Gwyn Jones.

3116a. Jonin, Pierre. "La Vengeance chez l'Iseut de Béroul et chez l'Iseut de Thomas." *Neophil.*, xxiii (1949), 207-209.

3116b. Joos, Martin, and Frederick R. Whitsell. *Middle High German Courtly Reader*. (Hartmann, Gottfried, Wolfram, Minne-

song.) Mimeographed typescript. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin, 1949.

3117. Jourda, Pierre. "Bibliographie de Bérout, *Tristan*." *Revue Universitaire*, 57 (July-October, 1948), 236.

3118. Koenraads, W. H. A. "Enkele Opmerkingen over de mogelijke Keltische Oorsprong van sommige Motiven uit de Tristansage." *Festschrift J. H. Scholte*. Amsterdam, 1947.

3119. Körner, Josef. *Bibliographisches Handbuch des deutschen Schrifttums*. (Ritterroman, pp. 98-106.) Dritte, völlig umgearbeitete und wesentlich vermehrte Auflage. Bern: Francke, 1949.

Lacina, Bohdam. See 3176, Jan Vilikovsky.

3120. de Lage, G. Raymond. "L'*Historia Britonum* source de l'*Histoire ancienne* jusqu'à César." *RMAL*, iv (1948), 275-278.

3120a. Långfors, Arthur. "'L'Anglais qui couve' dans l'imagination populaire du Moyen Age." (Reference to King Arthur and parallel to "Anglais coué.") *Mélanges Hæpffner*, pp. 89-94.

3120b. Lanham, Margaret. "Chastity: A Study of Sexual Morality in the English Medieval Romances." (Abstract of diss.) *Bulletin of Vanderbilt University*, XLVIII, No. 11 (1949), 8-9.

Le Gentil, P. See 3089, C. Foulon.

3121. Lejeune, Rita. "La Date du Roman de Jaufré." *MA*, LIV (1948), 257-295.

3001. Lethbridge, T. C. *Merlin's Island*. 1948.

Additional rev. by D. M. Waterman in *Antiquaries Journal*, xxix (1949), 220-221; by H. J. Fleure in *Man*, November, 1949, p. 131.

2042. Lévi-Provençal, E. *La Civilisation arabe en Espagne*. (Coll. Islam d'hier et d'aujourd'hui, I.) Reissued. Paris: G. P. Maisonneuve, 1948.

Rev. by Y. R[icaud] in *RHE*, XLIV (1949), 333.

3005. Loomis, Roger Sherman. *Introduction to Medieval Literature Chiefly in England*. 1948.

Rev. by Louis Furman Sas in *Rom. Phil.*, III (1949-1950), 220.

3122. ————. "Two Cruxes in the Text of Chrétien de Troyes." (Ynywl, Valdome.) *Mélanges Hæpffner*, pp. 227-235.

3123. ————. *Arthurian Tradition and Chrétien de Troyes*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1949.

Rev. in *LTLS*, January 20, 1950, p. 44; in *Virginia Quarterly Rev.*, xxv (Autumn, 1949), cxx; by Helaine Newstead in *Speculum*, xxiv (1949), 591-598; in *College English*, xi (1949), 117.

3124. ————. "Arthur," pp. 76-78; "Grail," pp. 461-462. In *Standard Dictionary of Folklore Mythology and Legend*. Vol. I. A-I. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co. (1949).

3125. ———. "A Parallel to the Franklin's Discussion of Mariage." (*Enfances Gauvain*.) *Philologica*, pp. 191-194.

3006. ——— and Rudolph Willard. *Medieval English Verse and Prose*. 1948.

Additional revs. by Beatrice White in *MLR*, XLIV (1949), 387-388; by A. Macdonald in *RES*, xxv (1949), 350-351.

Lucas, Henry. See 3059a, Ivor Arnold.

3126. MacClure, D. "Search for the Happy Isles." *Green Odyssey*, Autumn, 1947, pp. 135-140.

2890. McHugh, Sheila Joyce. *Sir Percyvelle*. 1946.

Additional rev. by G. Murphy in *Studies*, September, 1948, pp. 368-371.

2655. Magne, Augusto. *A Demanda do Santo Graal*. 1944.

Additional revs. by P. David in *Bull. des Etudes Portugaises*, x (1945), 235-239; by Manuel Rodrigues Lapa in *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica*, II (1948), 285-289.

3127. Marrou, H.-I. "Au Dossier de l'Amour Courtois." (Summary of recent articles.) *RMAL*, III (1947), 81-89.

3128. Matthew, G. (Article on Ideal of Knighthood in the Late Fourteenth Century; from the *Chandos Herald* and *Gawain and the Green Knight*.) *Studies in Mediaeval History Presented to Frederick Maurice Powicke*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, and New York: Oxford University Press, 1948.

3129. Maurer, Friedrich. "Das Ritterliche Tugendsystem." *Deu. Viertel.*, xxiii (1949), 274-285.

2659. Mergell, Bodo. *Wolfram von Eschenbach und seine französischen Quellen*. Vol. II. 1943.

Rev. by Friedrich Ranke in *ADA*, LXIV (1948), 24-26.

3129a. Micha, Alexandre. "Enéas et Cligès." *Mélanges Hæpffner*, pp. 237-243.

3130. Van Mierlo, J. *De oud- en middelnederlandse Letterkunde*. (Vols. I-II of *Geschiednis van de Letterkunde der Nederlanden*.) Antwerpen: N. V. Standaard-Boekhandel, 1949.

3131. Minis, C[ola]. "Die Bitte der Königin und das Hirschkopf-oder Kuzmotiv im *Erec*." *Neophil.*, xxix (1944), 154-158.

3132. de Montoliú, Manuel. "El Juicio de Cervantes sobre el 'Tirant lo Blanch.'" *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, xxix (1949), 263-277.

3133. de Moraes, Francisco. *Chrônica de Palmeirim de Inglaterra*. 2ª parte, tomo II. São Paulo: Anchieta, 1946.

3134. Moret, André. *Anthologie du Minnesong. Introduction, textes, notes et glossaire*. (Bibliothèque de Philologie Germanique, XIII.) (Includes "Le problème des origines," "La théorie de la

Minne," and "La service de la Minne.") Paris: Aubier, Editions Montaigne, 1949.

3134a. ———. "Qu'est-ce que la Minne? Contribution à l'étude de la terminologie et la mentalité courtoises." *Etudes germaniques*, iv (1949), 1-12.

3135. Morgan, T. J. "Cyfeithu'r Mabinogion." (2994, Jones and Jones.) *Y Llenor*, xxviii (1949), 8-15.

3136. Mosse, Fernand. *Manuel de l'Anglais du moyen-âge des origines au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle*. II: Moyen Anglais. 2 vols. (Includes Lawman, *Le Brut*; *Sire Gauvain et le Chevalier Vert*; *La Morte d'Arthur* [allit.]; Malory.) (Bibliothèque de Philologie Germanique, XII.) Paris: Aubier, Editions Montaigne, 1949.

3137. Nardi, Bruno. "Di un nuovo commento alla canzone del Cavalcanti sull' amore." (Comment on Casella.) *Cult. Neolat.*, vi/vii (1947-48), 123-135.

3138. Naumann, Hans. "Hartmann von Aue und Cicero?" *Deu. Viertel.*, xxiii (1949), 285-287.

3139. Nearing, Homer, Jr. "Local Caesar Traditions in Britain." *Speculum*, xxiv (1949), 218-227.

3140. ———. "The Legend of Julius Caesar's British Conquest." *PMLA*, lxiv (1949), 889-929.

2899b. Neri, Ferdinando. *I Lai di Maria di Francia*. (Reprints "Guigemar e Prodesaggio" and 2085, "La voce 'lai' nei testi italiani.") 1946.

Rev. by R. M. Ruggieri in *Cult. Neolat.*, viii (1948), 139-141; in *N&Q*, cxviii (July 10, 1948), 308.

3141. N[eto], S[erafim] S[ilva]. "Nota sobre a Cronologia dos Textos medievais." (Includes *Demanda do Santo Graal*.) *Boletim de Filologia*, ii (1947), 82-85.

3142. Newman, Ernest. *The Wagner Operas*. New York: A. A. Knopf, 1949.

Rev. in *Opera News*, xiv, 7 (December 12, 1949), 20, 32.

3143. Nitze, William A. "Arthurian Names: Arthur." *PMLA*, lxiv (1949), 585-596; "correction," *ibid.*, 1235.

3144. ———. *Perceval and the Holy Grail: An Essay on the Romance of Chrétien de Troyes*. (Univ. of Cal. Pub. in Mod. Phil., xxviii, No. 5, 281-332.) Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1949.

Rev. by Harry F. Williams in *Rom. Phil.*, iii (1949-50), 218-220; by William Roach in *Speculum*, xxv (1950), 290-291.

3145. Norman, F. "Der von Kurenberg." *Lond. Med. St.*, i, 1939 (1948), 333-339.

2806. Nykl, A. R. *Hispano-Arabic Poetry*. 1946.  
Additional revs. by William J. Entwistle in *MLR*, XLIV (1949), 415-416;  
(by C.V.A.?) in *Bull. Hisp.*, LI (1949), 87-88.
- 3020a. O'Rahilly, Thomas F. *Early Irish History and Mythology*. 1946.  
Rev. by Tom Peete Cross in *MP*, XLVI (1949), 273-275; by Lugh in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, November, 1948, pp. 1039-1042; see also Cross (3074), "Celtic Mythology and Arthurian Romance."
3146. Parry, John J. "A Bibliography of Critical Arthurian Literature for the year 1948." *MLQ*, x (1949), 220-235.
3147. Parry, Thomas. "Ymadawiad Arthur, 1902:1910:1926." (A comparison of the three versions of poem by T. Gwynn Jones.) *Y Llenor*, xxviii (1949), 125-134.
3148. Patch, Howard R. "The Adaptation of Otherworld Motifs to Medieval Romance." (Arthurian examples.) *Philologica*, pp. 115-123.
2906. Patchell, Mary Frances. *The Palmerin Romances*. 1947.  
Rev. by L. F. Casson in *MLR*, XLIV (1949), 261.
3149. Peteri, B. H. "Vergelijking van Esmoreit en 'Ferguut.'" *TNTL*, LXIV (1946), 13-18.
3025. Politi, Francesco. *La Lirica del Minnesang. Testi, Profili, Versioni*. 1948.  
Rev. by Margaret F. Richey in *Erasmus*, II, Nos. 17-18 (1949), 534-538.
2910. Pons, E. *Sire Gauvain et le Chevalier Vert*. 1946.  
Rev. by E. Buysens in *Rev. Belge*, xxvi (1948), 192-194.
- 3149a. ———. "Note sur Gauvain et le Chevalier Vert (790 embaned)." *Mélanges Hæpffner*, pp. 71-75.
3150. Priestly, F. E. L. "Tennyson's Idylls." *Univ. of Toronto Q.*, xix (October, 1949), 35-49.
3151. Prioult, A. "Une Mysterieuse conquête du roi Arthur. Lecto." *Let. Rom.*, III (1949), 44-48.
2115. Raglan, Lord (FitzRoy Richard Somerset). *The Hero*. 1936. Reprinted in the "Thinker's Library." London: Watts, 1949.
3152. Ranke, Friedrich. "Etwas vom Bärenfang im Mittelalter (Zu Gottfrieds Tristan v. 284)." *ZDPh.*, LXX (1947-49), 225-233.
- 1464(?) ———. *Gottfried von Strassburg. Tristan und Isolde*. Fotomechanischer Nachdruck. Berlin & Frankfurt a/M: Weidmannsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1949.
3153. Richards, Gertrude R. B. "An Early Edition of the 'Morte d'Arthur.'" *More Books*, January, 1946, pp. 18-20.

3154. Richards, Melville. "Gildas a'r Brytaniaid." (*Red Book*.) *BBCS*, XIII (1949), 64-65.

3155. ———. "Cadwy fab Geraint" (*Dream of Rhonabwy and Culhwch ac Olwen*), and "Brain Owain ab Urien." *BBCS*, XIII (1949), 136-137.

3156. von Richthofen, E. *Studien zur romanischen Heldensage des Mittelalters*. (Some contacts with courtly matters.) Halle: Niemeyer, 1944.

3157. de Riquer, Martin. *La Lirica de los Trovadores Antología comentada*. Tomo I. *Poetas del siglo XII*. Barcelona: Escuela de Filología, 1948.

Rev. by H. J. Chaytor in *MLR*, XLIV (1949), 413-414; (by C. V. Aubrum?) in *Bull. Hisp.*, LI (1949), 88-89; by René Lavaud in *RLR*, LXX (1949), 174-176, and in *Rom.*, LXXI (1950), 115-116.

2419. Roach, William. *The Didot "Perceval"* 1941.

Rev. by István Frank in *MA*, LIV (1948), 170-176; by Mary Williams in *French Studies*, III (1949), 74-75.

3158. ———. *Continuations of the Old French Perceval of Chrétien de Troyes*. Vol. I. The First Continuation, redaction of MSS T, V, D. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press; London: Cumberlege, 1949.

Rev. in *LTLS*, January 20, 1950, p. 44; by Lawton P. G. Peckham in *Speculum*, xxv (1950), 292-294.

3159. Robertson, D. W., Jr. "Marie de France, 'Lais,' Prologue 13-16." *MLN*, LXIV (1949), 336-338.

3160. Roncaglia, Aurelio. "Accostamento ad un poeta medioevale (A proposito di un libro di R. R. Bezzola su Cristiano di Troyes)." *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*. Classe di lettere, storia e filosofia. II, xvii (1948), 91-109.

3161. Roques, Mario. "L'Ancien français 'enaines' et le vers 1676 du Tristan de Béroul." *Rom.*, LXIX (1946-47), 534-540.

3161b. ———. "Chrétien de Troyes. Le Conte du Graal." Reprinted in *Etudes de littérature française*. (Société des publications romanes et françaises, XXVIII.) Lille: Giard, and Genève: Droz, 1949.

See R. Bossuat in *MA*, LV (1949), 404-405.

3161a. Ross, Alan S. C. "Hengist's Watchword." (Nennius, Geoffrey, Bruts, etc.) *English and Germanic Studies*, II (1948-49), 81-101.

3162. Rossi, Giuseppe Carlo. "L'Orlando Furioso in Portogallo." *Cult. Neolat.*, iv/v (1944-45), 132-150.

3163. Ruiz de Conde, Justina. *El Amor y el matrimonio secreto en los Libros de Caballerías*. (Radcliffe diss., 1945.) Madrid: M. Aguilar, 1948.

Rev. by Otis H. Green in *Hisp. Rev.*, xvii (1949), 340-343; by Maria Rosa Lida de Malkiel in *Rom. Phil.*, III (1949-50), 224-225.



3164. Sachse, Johannes. *La Chanson du Chevalier au Cygne*. An edition of the OF Epic Poem as found in MS 12558, Fonds Français, of the B. N. in Paris. (Wisconsin diss., June, 1948, unpub.?)

3165. Savage, Henry L. "The Green Knight's *Molaynes*." (*Gawain and the Green Knight*.) *Philologica*, pp. 167-178.

2685. Scherer, Margaret R. *About the Round Table*. 1945.

Rev. by A. Closs in *Contemporary Rev.*, May, 1948, pp. 319-320.

3165a. Scholte, J. H. "Kyot von Katelangen." *Neophil.*, xxxiii (1949), 23-36.

3166. Schurmann, P. F. "Leyenda a 'Chrétien de Troyes et son œuvre' del Dr. G. Cohen." *Boletín de Filología* (Montevideo), i (1936-37), 281-304.

3167. Shannon, Edgar F., Jr. "The Proofs of *Gareth and Lynette* in the Widener Collection." *PBSA*, xli (1947), 321-340.

3168. Shaw, J. E. *Guido Cavalcanti's Theory of Love. The Canzone d'Amore and Other Related Problems*. (Univ. of Toronto Romance Series, 1.) Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1949.

Rev. in *LTLS*, March 10, 1950, p. 155; by Charles S. Singleton in *Speculum*, xxv (1950), 144-148.

3169. Silverstein, Theodore. "Andreas, Plato and the Arabs. Remarks on some Recent Accounts of Courtly Love." *MP*, xlvii (1949), 117-126.

3169a. Singleton, Charles S. *An Essay on the Vita Nuova*. (Courtly love.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949.

Rev. by Kenneth McKenzie in *Speculum*, xxiv (1949), 452-455; by J. E. Shaw in *MLN*, lxv (1950), 262-264; by E. R. Vincent in *MLR*, xlv (1950), 94-95.

3170. Smith, Roland M. "Gernemuße and the Benighted Geography of the Minstrels." (*Layamon, Sir Tristrem*.) *MLN*, lxiv (1949), 70-72.

3041. Sparnaay, H. *Karl Lachmann als Germanist*. 1948.

Additional revs. by H. Meyer in *Museum*, liv (1949), 8-10; by T. A. Rompelman in *Levende Talen* (1949), pp. 243-246; by C. Minis in *Der Wächter*, xxxi (1949), 70-71; by R.-M. S. Heffner in *JEGP*, xlviii (1949), 298-299.

3170a. Speirs, John. "Sir Gawain and the Green Knight." *Scrutiny*, xvi, No. 4 (Winter, 1949), 274-300.

3171. Spence, Lewis. "Scotland in Mediaeval Romance." *Scots Magazine*, April, 1947, pp. 37-46.

3172. Stevenson, Lionel. "The High-Born Maiden Symbol in Tenyson." (Malory.) *PMLA*, lxiv (1949), 234-243.

3172a. Stokoe, William C., Jr. "The Work of the Redactors of *Sir Launfal*, *Richard Coeur de Lion*, and *Sir Degaré*." *Cornell University Abstracts of Theses*, 1946 (1947), pp. 26-29.

2427. Stolte, Heinz. *Eilhart und Gottfried*. 1941.

Additional rev. by Helmut de Boor in *ZDPh*, LXIX (1944-45), 217-221.

3173. Taylor, F. Sherwood. "The Argument of *Morien and Merlin*: An English Alchemical Poem." *Chymia: Annual Studies in the History of Chemistry*, I (1948), 23-35.

3173a. Thomas of Britain. *I Frammenti del romanzo di Tristano*. Torino: Gheroni, 1949.

3173b. Thomas, David. *Hen Longau a Llongwyr Cymru. Old Ships and Sailors of Wales*. (Bilingual.) Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1949.

Rev. (diffusive comments on early material) by J. Glyn Davies in *THSC*, 1948 (1949), pp. 475-487.

3174. Uttley, Alison. "Tintagel: 'King Arthur's Country.'" *London Calling*, February 12, 1948, pp. 13-14.

3175. Vancsa, Kurt. "Der Wiener Erec." *Jahrbuch für Landeskunde von Niederösterreich*. 1948.

3176. Vilikovsky, Jan. *Mabinogi: keltské povesti*. With 17 wood engravings by Bohdam Lacina. Brno: Edice Atlantis, 1944.

2925. Vinaver, Eugène. *The Works of Sir Thomas Malory*. 1947.

Additional revs. by M[ario] R[oaues] in *Rom.*, LXX (1948-49), 555-556; by Edith C. Batho in *MLR*, XLIV (1949), 260; in *LTLS*, June 7, 1947, pp. 273-274.

3177. ———. "La Genèse de la 'Suite de Merlin.'" *Mélanges Hæpffner*, pp. 295-300.

3178. Wade-Evans, A. W. "The Origin of Glastonbury." *N&Q*, CXCI (April 3, 1948), 134-135.

3179. ———. "The Origin of Cornwall." *N&Q*, CXCI (July 10, 1948), 289-292.

3179a. ———. "Pwy ydyw'r Cymry." (Magnus Maximus, etc.) *Y Corn Gwlad*, I (1949-50), 62-64.

3179b. Wagner, Robert-Louis. "Sorcier" et "Magicien"—*Contribution à l'étude du vocabulaire de la magie*. Paris: Droz, 1937.

See 3191, Paul Zumthor.

3180. Walshe, M. O'C. "Notes on *Parzival*, Book V." *Lond. Med. St.*, I, 1939 (1948), 340-353.

3180a. Ward, Gordon. "Hengest." *Archaeologia Cantiana*, LXI (1948), 77-97.

3181. Watkin, Dom Aelred (editor). *The Great Chartulary of Glastonbury*. Vol. I. (Somerset Record Society.) Bath: Downside Abbey, Printed for subscribers only, 1947.

Rev. in *LTLS*, January 22, 1950, p. 61; by F. T. Wainwright in *Antiquity*, XXIII (1949), 224-225.

3182. Watkin, Morgan. "Sangnarwy ac Oed Kulhwch ac Olwen y Llyfr Gwyn." (See 2997, Thomas Jones.) *BBCS*, XIII (1949), 132-136.

3183. Watson, Melvin R. "The Chronology of 'Sir Gawain and the Green Knight.'" *MLN*, LXIV (1949), 85-86.

3184. Weber, Gottfried. *Parzival. Ringen und Vollendung. Eine dichtungs- und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Oberursel: Kompass-Verlag, 1948.

Rev. by Julius Schwieterung in *ADA*, LXIV (1948), 14-20.

3185. Wellner, Franz. *Die Troubadours. Leben und Lieder. Verdeutscht und eingeleitet*. (Sammlung Dieterich, Band 104.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1942.

Rev. by Franz Rauhut in *DLZ*, LXVI/LXVIII (1945-47), 75-76.

3186. Wentzlaff-Eggebert, Friedrich-Wilhelm. "Ritterliche Lebenslehre und antike Ethik." *Deu. Viertel.*, XXIII (1949), 252-273.

3187. Whiting, B. J. "Emerson and Merlin's Dungeon Made of Air." *PMLA*, LXIV (1949), 598-599.

Whitsell, Frederick R. See 3116b, Martin Joos.

3051. Williams, Charles. *Arthurian Torso*. 1948.

Rev. by John E. Housman in *RESNS*, I (1950), 84-85, and in *English*, VII (1949), 189-190. See also 3112, David Jones.

2929. Williams, Harry F. (editor). *Floriant et Florete*. 1947.

Additional rev. by F. Whitehead in *MLR*, XLIV (1949), 273-274.

Wilson, R. M. See 3100, Kenneth Hare.

3188. Winbolt, S. E. *Britain under the Romans*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books [1945].

Rev. by Marcel Renard in *Latomus*, VIII (1949), 96.

3189. Wind, B. H. "Quelques remarques sur la versification du Tristan de Thomas." *Neophil.*, XXXIII (1949), 85-94.

3190. ———. "Arthuriana (Impressions d'un congrès)." *Neophil.*, XXXIII (1949), 125-127.

3055. Zeydel, Edwin H. *The "Tristan and Isolde" of Gottfried von Strassburg*. 1948.

Rev. in *LTLS*, July 15, 1949, p. 413; by John Lancaster Riordan in *JEGP*, XLVIII (1949), 611-613; by August Closs in *MLN*, LXV (1950), 212-214, and in *MLR*, XLIV (1949), 585-586; by George Nordmeyer in *Ger. Rev.*, xxv (1950), 124-125.

3191. Zumthor, Paul. "Sorcier et magicien—A propos d'un livre de R.-L. Wagner." (See 3179b.) *ZRPh*, LXV (1949), 441-457.

## INDEX

- Alchemy, 3173.  
 Andreas Capellanus, 2837a, 2861, 3169.  
 Aneirin, 3114.  
 Anthology, 3025, 3098, 3116b, 3134, 3136, 3157.  
 Arabic civilization, 2402; influence, 3094, 3169; poetry, 2806.  
 Ariosto, 2940.  
 Arthur, King, 3076a, 3109, 3110, 3111, 3124, 3143, 3151, 3174.  
 Arthurians, List of, 3056, 3093.  
 Attitudes, 2775.  
 Avalon, 3092.  
 Bardic tradition, 3058.  
*Barzas Breis*, 3084b.  
 Belgian bibliography, 3089.  
 Bérout, 3106a, 3116a, 3117, 3161.  
 Bibliography, 3005, 3057, 3081, 3089, 3093, 3108, 3117, 3119, 3146.  
 Boiardo, 3066.  
 Breguion, Battle of, 3110.  
*Bruts*, Welsh, 3059a, 3161a.  
 Brutus legend, 3102.  
 Cadwy fab Geraint, 3155.  
 Caesar, Julius, 3120, 3139, 3140.  
*Cansone d'Amore*, 3168.  
 Catalan, 3070.  
 Cavalcanti, Guido, 3137, 3168.  
 Celtic mythology, 3074; sources, 3118; twilight, 3075.  
 Cervantes, 3132.  
 Chandos Herald, 3128.  
 Chartulary, 3181.  
 Chastity, 3120b.  
 Chaucer, 3125.  
*Chevalier au Cygne*, 3078, 3164.  
 Chivalry, 3062a, 3073b.  
 Chrétien de Troyes, 860, 2659, 2838, 3064, 3099, 3103, 3122, 3123, 3144, 3160, 3166; *Cligès*, 3129a; *Erec*, 3099, 3131; *Perceval*, 2967, 3144; *Yvain*, 3101; *Conte du Graal*, 3161b; continuations, 3158.  
*Chroniques Gargantuines*, 3091.  
 Chronology, 3141, 3183.  
 Cicero, 3138.  
 Cleanness, 3073.  
 Color symbolism, 3082a.  
*Comus*, 3068.  
 Congress, Arthurian, 3189.  
 Cornwall, 3179.  
 Courtly literature, 2758; love, 2855, 3065, 3067, 3094, 3127, 3169.  
 Culhwch, see *Kulhwch*.  
*Cycles of the Kings*, 2773.  
 Czech versions, 3113, 3176.  
 Dante, 3169a.  
*Demanda do Santo Graal*, 2655, 3141.  
*Didot Perceval*, 2419.  
*Dove's Neck-Ring*, 3094.  
*Dream of Rhonabwy*, 3075, 3155.  
 Dutch bibliography, 3081; literature, 3130.  
 Eilhart von Oberg, 2427, 3106a.  
 Emerson, R. W., 3058, 3187.  
*Enéas*, 3106a, 3129a.  
*Enfances Gauvain*, 3125.  
 English literature, medieval, 2862, 3005, 3006, 3120b.  
*Erec*, 3131, 3175.  
*Esmoreit*, 3149.  
*Facrie Queene*, 3060.  
*Fergus*, 3149.  
*Florian et Florete*, 2929.  
 Folk heroes, 2983.  
 Franklin (Chaucer's), 3125.  
 French literature, bibliography, 3089; medieval, 1949, 3098.  
*Galeran de Bretagne*, 3082.  
*Gareth and Lynette*, 3167.  
 Gargantua, 3091, 3092.  
 Gawain, Gauvain, 3125; *Gawain and the Green Knight*, 2910, 3065a, 3073, 3073a, 3080, 3082a, 3100, 3128, 3136, 3149a, 3165, 3170a, 3183.  
 Geoffrey of Monmouth, 3059a, 3061a, 3068, 3075, 3086, 3102, 3115, 3161a.  
 Geography, 3112, 3170.  
 Gerald the Welshman, 3115.  
 German literature, medieval, 3061, 3096, 3116b.  
 Gernemuße, 3170.  
 Gildas, 2941, 3154, 3173b.  
 Glastonbury, 3178, 3181.  
 Goddess, The White, 3097.  
 Godefroid de Bouillon, 3078.  
*Gormont et Isembart*, 3059a.  
 Gottfried von Strassburg, 1464, 2427, 2547, 3055, 3116b, 3152.  
 Grail, 1829, 2655, 3124, 3141, 3144.  
 Gralsburg, 3059.  
 Handsome Coward, 2379.  
 Happy Isles, 3126.  
 Hartmann von Aue, 3116b, 3138.  
 Hengist, 3161a, 3180a.  
 Heresy of Courtly Love, 2855.  
 Hero, 2115, 2983.  
*Historia Britonum*, 3120.  
 Ibn Hazm, 3094.  
 Iconography, 2685.  
 Immermann, K. L., 3105.  
 Ireland, 3105.

- Irish history, 3020e; literature, 2773; mythology, 3020a; 3074.  
 Iseult, 3116a; see also Tristan.
- Jaufré*, 2444a, 3121.  
 Jones, T. Gwynn, 3147.  
 Jovens, 3076.
- Kiot, Kyot, 3063, 3104, 3161a.  
 Knightly ideal, 3093a, 3128, 3129, 3186.  
*Kulhwch (Culhwch) ac Olwen*, 3114, 3116, 3155, 3182.  
 Kurenberg, 3145.
- Lachmann, Karl, 3041.  
 Lancelot, 3093a.  
 Lawman, Layamon, 3059a, 3069, 3102, 3136, 3170.  
 Lear, King, 3086.  
 Lecto, 3151.  
 Libros de Caballerías, 3163.  
 Lion, 3101.  
 Lithuania, 3151.  
*Llyfr Gwyn*, 3182.  
 Lohengrin, 3078.  
 Love and War, 2862.
- Mabinogion*, 2994, 3113, 3114, 3135, 3176.  
 Magnus Maximus, 3179, 3179a.  
 Malory, 2925, 3060, 3136, 3153, 3172.  
 Marcabru, 3084a.  
 Marie de France, 2899b, 3107, 3159.  
 Mark, King, 3179.  
 Merlin, 3092, 3173, 3177, 3187; Merlin's island, 3001; Vulgate *Merlin*, 3058.  
 Milton, 3068.  
 Mimesis, 2754, 3106.  
 Minne, 3134a.  
 Minnesong, 3025, 3067, 3084, 3093c, 3116b, 3134.  
 M.L.A., Arthurian Romance section, 3056.  
*Molaynes*, 3165.  
 Morgan la Fée, 3079, 3091, 3092.  
*Morgante*, 2621a.  
*Morien and Merlin*, 3173.  
*Morte Arthur* (alliterative), 3136.  
*Morte d'Arthur*, 3093d.  
*Morte Darthur*, see Malory.  
*Morte le Roi Artu*, 3109a.  
 Myth, Mythology, 3020a, 3079, 3097, 3111.
- Names, proper, 3090a.  
 Nauclerus, Johannes, 3086.  
 Nennius, 3115, 3161a, 3173b.  
 Norse motifs, 3069.  
 Northumbria, 2941.
- Origins of courtly literature, 2758; of lyric, 2551.
- Orlando Furioso*, 3162.  
 Otherworld motifs, 3148.  
 Owain fab Urien, 3155.
- Palmecir de Inglaterra*, 3133.  
*Palmerin*, 2906.  
*Parzival*, 2308, 2989, 3090a, 3180, 3184.  
*Pearl*, 3073a.  
*Perceforêt*, 3087.  
*Perceval*, 2419, 2967, 3099, 3144.  
 Plantagenets, 3102.  
 Plato, 3169.  
 Portuguese literature, 2655, 3162.  
 Pseudo-Wauchier, 3158.  
 Pulci, 2621a.
- Queste*, 3109a.  
 Quonomorius, 3179.
- Red Book*, 3154.  
*Rennewart*, 3083.  
 Rhonabwy, see *Dream of Rhonabwy*.  
 Roman Britain, 3072, 3188.  
 Round Table, 2685.
- Scotland, 3171.  
*Sir Degaré*, 3172a.  
*Sir Degrevant*, 3071.  
*Sir Galahad*, 3077.  
 Sir Gawain, see Gawain.  
*Sir Launfal*, 3172a.  
*Sir Percyvelle*, 2890.  
*Sir Tristram*, 3170.  
 Snowdon, 3122.  
 Sorcerer, 3179b, 3191.  
 Spanish literature, 3163.  
 Spenser, 3060.  
 Strathclyder, 3109.  
*Suite de Merlin*, 3177.  
 Suso, Heinrich, 3067.
- Tennyson, Alfred, 3077, 3093d, 3150, 3167, 3172.  
 Thomas of Britain, 3116a, 3173a, 3189.  
 Tintagel, 3174.  
*Tirant lo Blanch*, 3132.  
 Tristan, 1464, 3055, 3106a, 3117, 3118, 3152, 3161, 3173a, 3189.  
*Tristan und Isolde*, 3055, 3085, 3088, 3095, 3105; *Tristan und Isolt*, 1464, 2547, 3185.  
 Troubadours, 2762, 3062, 3065, 3076, 3093c, 3157, 3185.  
 Tuebingen, 3086.  
 Turkish material, 3060, 3076a.
- Valdone, 3122.  
 Vengeance, 3116a.  
*Vita Nuova*, 3169a.  
 Vocabulary, 3073, 3073a.  
*Vray Gargantua*, 3092.

- Vulgate *Merlin*, 3058; *Lancelot*, 3093a;  
*Queste*, 3109a; *Morte le Roi Artu*,  
3109a.
- Wace, 3059a, 3106a.
- Wagner, Richard, 3085, 3088, 3095,  
3142.
- Wales, 3115.
- Welsh literature, 3097, 3122, 3123;  
history, 3061a.
- White Book*, 3182.
- White Goddess, The, 3097.
- Wildenberg im Odenwald, 3059.
- Williams, Charles, 3051, 3112.
- Wolfram von Eschenbach, 2308, 2659,  
2989, 3063, 3103, 3104, 3116b, 3180.
- Ymadawiad Arthur*, 3147.
- Ynywl, 3122.

## REVIEWS

*Ernst Toller and His Ideology.* By WILLIAM ANTHONY WILLIBRAND. Iowa City: University of Iowa Humanistic Studies VII, 1945. Pp. 123. \$1.00.

The author's honest attempt to interpret ideologically Toller's whole work and life is well written and on the whole successful. The study, which is a condensation of a dissertation, contains seven chapters covering the life of Toller, his activities, and works. Toller's strong pacifist leanings lasting throughout his life, his turn to unorthodox Marxism, as also his valiant struggle against National Socialism, are clearly presented in the first four chapters. Chapters V, VI, and VII deal with Toller's fight against the abuses of the courts, his attitude towards religion as shown in plays like *Wunder in Amerika* (translated as *Mary Baker Eddy*) and *Pastor Hall*, and a summary.

Chapter I describes Toller's slow turning away from bourgeois ideals to pacifist and socialist ones. It stresses Toller's sensitivity to the influences of his environment and his lack of the power of self-analysis as shown in the autobiographical *Eine Jugend*. In Toller's realization of a decline of creative power and lack of faith, Mr. Willibrand sees the real causes for the latter's suicide. Toller was not a martyr.

As to the much debated question of Toller's Marxist leanings, Mr. Willibrand proves ably that Toller never was a true Marxist because of his abhorrence of violence and human sacrifice, his awareness of the weaknesses of the proletariat, his doubts that economy can cure all ills. "The old simple ideals of love, peace, and brotherhood in a socialized collectivity—*Gemeinschaft*—that was Toller's dream," writes Mr. Willibrand.

The very detailed analyses of all of Toller's works are interesting and convincing; they seem especially good on *Hinkemann*, *Masse Mensch*, and *No More Peace*. Of works by other dramatists only Hauptmann's *Die Weber* is used for comparison. It seems a decided weakness that Mr. Willibrand did not use other plays, like Kaiser's *Gas* or Stefan Zweig's work on Mary Baker Eddy, for comparison. The bibliography might have included the critical works on modern literature by Mahrholz, Naumann, and Borchardt. Although Mr. Willibrand's study, because of its theme, does not answer the question of the artistic significance of Ernst Toller's work and what of it will live, his treatise will be a help to the future literary historian.

MIMI I. JEHL

University of Illinois

*The German Woman in the Age of Enlightenment: A Study in the Drama from Gottsched to Lessing.* By S. ETTA SCHREIBER. New York: King's Crown Press, Columbia University Germanic Studies, N.S., No. 19, 1948. Pp. 243.

To ascertain the position, or, more often, the plight, of women in the Age of "Aufklärung" Miss Schreiber here examines many plays, most of them from the period 1740-1750. Some readers may take issue with the author in completely ruling out poetry (both epic and lyric) and the novel as "unrealistic,"



holding no mirror to contemporary life. On the other hand, the major role of the "moral weeklies," which supply inspiration and guidance for the playwrights, receives well-deserved attention.

From a consideration of the enlightened, pioneering efforts of these periodicals toward female emancipation we are led to a discussion of plays by Frau Gottsched, Borkenstein, Krüger, J. E. Schlegel, Gellert, Weisse, and Lessing. The first two, drawing upon lessons taught in the "weeklies," emphasize in their principal female characters evils and vices to be overcome. Frau Gottsched, however, anticipates in some measure the next generation represented by Krüger, in whose plays a more positive approach is apparent. His chief feminine characters exemplify virtues eminently worthy of emulation. They display a spirit considerably in advance of their time and even insist on certain individual rights in defiance of social tradition and parental authority. The parents, of course, represent a chief obstacle in the path of emancipation. A rather special aura of mystery, however, surrounds the "Aufklärung" mother. As Miss Schreiber observes, the mothers in these pieces are almost never in any sense admirable. What, then, has become of the sensible, virtuous heroines in which, according to the playwrights, the age abounded? Apparently they do not become mothers. The playwrights do not say.

The four comedies of J. E. Schlegel recapitulate and then advance the rationalistic development toward self-consciousness and independence already encountered in his predecessors. At the same time, the sentimental dictates of the heart begin to claim attention.

In Gellert and Weisse sentimentality is underscored. While their heroines are now comparatively free from external compulsions, sentimentalism enjoins a new passivity, with not infrequent tears and renunciation as its doubtful rewards. On the other hand, it is the breath of sentiment infused into the rationalistic heroine which makes possible the creation of Lessing's masterful feminine characters.

The changing social attitude toward women thus finds reflection in the female dramatic figures of the period: "As they change from the incarnation of vices or virtues to characters human and alive, their rights as individuals are more and more recognized. . . . Lessing, as the only dramatist of this period with superior gifts, created the first genuinely human feminine characters and at the same time the first women of independent judgment, whose wit and human sympathy are equal to the problems that face them."

The work is strongest, it seems to me, in its first third, which deals on the whole with less familiar material. It can be recommended as a clear and careful presentation of an interesting and significant aspect of the Enlightenment.

F. ANDREW BROWN

*University of Michigan*

*Aus frühmittelhochdeutscher Dichtung: Ein Lesebuch.* By BRUNO BOESCH. Vol. 8, "Altdeutsche Übungstexte," herausgegeben von der akademischen Gesellschaft schweizerischer Germanisten. Bern: A. Francke, 1948. Pp. 71. 3.50 S.Fr.

*Das Nibelungenlied. In Auswahl.* By FRIEDRICH RANKE. Vol. 9, "Altdeutsche Übungstexte." Bern: A. Francke, 1948. Pp. 80. 3.50 S.Fr.

These two little volumes will be warmly greeted in these days, when it is so difficult to procure the old standard M.H.G. texts. Both volumes bring a considerable amount of material within their limits, although selections of this nature are, of course, always open to criticism, and each individual reader will wish that certain other selections had been included in addition to, or in place of, those chosen by the editor. In keeping with the Swiss tradition, the print is excellent.

In regard to these two texts, Boesch had the more difficult problem of selection. To attain a semblance of unity, he restricted himself to religious poetry in the spirit of the Cluniac reform. Eighteen samples of such poetry are brought, the first being the introduction to the *Pilatuslegende*, and the others under three large headings: (1) Aus Gebet und Sündenklage (*Arnsteiner Marienleich*, *Litanei*, *Vorauer Sündenklage*, *Memento Mori*, Heinrich von Melks *Vom des tödes gehugede* and *Priesterleben*, and Des armen Hartmann *Rede vom Glauben*); (2) Aus dogmatischer und biblischer Dichtung (*Essos Gesang*, *Vom Rechte*, *Die Hochzeit*, *Das Trudpeter Hohelied*, *Frau Avas Leben Jesu*, *Altdeutsche Genesis*, and Wernhers *Maria*); (3) Aus Legende und geistlicher Epik (*Annelied*, *Kaiserchronik*, *Rolandslid* des Pfaffen Konrad, and *Albers Trugdalsus*). None of the eighteen samples is a complete work, although *Memento Mori* is given almost in toto, with only stanzas 8 and 9 (incomplete in the MS) omitted.

For the most part, Boesch took his selections directly from other critical editions without change. The list of such sources is given on pages 5 and 6. The very last line of the selection from *Memento Mori* is the only reading which we are told differs from the source. However, in the *Rolandslid*, Boesch drops the acute accent (which the MSS often have over the vowels of rhyming syllables and over *i* in any position in the word and in the verse) and the circumflex (chiefly over long vowels and in rhyming syllables).

A few misprints seem to have got into Boesch's volume. On pages 3 and 12 we find the usual spelling *Marienleich*, but on page 5 we have *Marieneleich*, *Mariensequens*, and *Marienenlob*. On page 25, line 2497, *nit* is used for *nit*. On page 61, line 5517, *ward* occurs for *wart*, although the latter spelling is otherwise used.

Ranke's selections from the *Nibelungenlied* include a number of those usually found in editions of this kind, but also some that are not so well known. The following *Aventiure* are given at least in part: I, Introduction; X, Kriemhild's Reception at Worms; XIV, Quarrel of the Queens; XVI, Siegfried's Death; XVII, Kriemhild's Mourning and Siegfried's Burial; XXXI, Hagen Prophecies the Early Death of Ortlieb, Son of Etzel and Kriemhild; XXXIII, Battle between Burgundians and Huns; XXXVI, Burning of the Hall upon Kriemhild's Command; XXXVII, Rüdiger's Death; XXXIX, Death of Gunther, Hagen, and Kriemhild. That this is a good selection is evident, but it might have been well to give the connecting links in short summaries.

Ranke's text largely follows Bartsch's critical edition (1870-1876), which is based upon MS B, but Siever's (1930) and De Boor's (1940) editions were used as checks. For the variant MSS readings, Ranke checked Bartsch's citations by means of copies and editions of MSS A, B, and C, while for the most part the readings of the poorer MSS D, a, b, d, and h were not taken into consideration. No misprints were noticed in this volume.

One more thing must be mentioned: these volumes have no vocabulary and no explanatory notes. This fact makes their use somewhat difficult, especially for beginners, and will undoubtedly weigh heavily against their adoption in American schools. Boesch gives no MSS variants whatsoever, and Ranke only for pages 3-46 of his selections. For both these little volumes it might be worthwhile to bring out a small supplement including a vocabulary, explanatory notes for difficult and unusual words, forms, and syntactical constructions, and (at least for Boesch) a critical apparatus.

LESTER W. J. SEIFERT

*University of Wisconsin*

*Hoffmann: Author of the Tales.* By HARVEY W. HEWETT-THAYER. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1948. Pp. viii + 416. \$6.00.

Der schönen und dankbaren Aufgabe, die erste in englischer Sprache abgefaßte Einführung in das Werk E. T. A. Hoffmanns zu schreiben, unterzog sich Professor Hewett-Thayer, und das Ergebnis seiner auf eingehendster Sachkenntnis fußenden und mit bewundernswertem Fleiß verfolgten Bemühungen kommt in Gestalt eines ansehnlichen Bandes zu Hoffmanns hundertfünf- und zwanzigsten Todestage eben zurecht.

Das Buch richtet sich gleichermaßen an gebildete Laien und an fachwissenschaftlich orientierte Leser, und diese an sich verständliche doppelte Zwecksetzung bringt fast unüberwindliche Schwierigkeiten mit sich. Ist es nämlich einmal die echtem Enthusiasmus entsprungene Absicht des Autors, ein Bild des Menschen und Künstlers Hoffmann und seines Werkes zu entwerfen, das weitgehenderer Anteilnahme und tieferem Verständnis den Weg ebnet, so muß er andererseits dem Ideal einer schon längst nicht mehr anmutigen aber um so nachdrücklicher rückhaltlosen Gelehrsamkeit Tribut zollen, was in Gestalt einer möglichst ausgiebigen Ausbreitung des Tatsachenmaterials auf Kosten der darstellerischen Wirkung geschieht. Die Aussichten, auf diesem Wege Wertvolles für die Hoffmannforschung zu leisten, sind insofern gering, als die Arbeiten Georg Ellingers, Hans von Müllers und Carl Georg von Maassens biographisch und philologisch kaum ergänzungsbedürftig sind. Hingegen weisen Richard von Schaukels von feinsinniger Einfühlung getragene und in der Darstellung meisterhafte Skizze *E. T. A. Hoffman. Sein Werk aus seinem Leben dargestellt* und Ernst von Schencks tiefgründiger und geistreicher Deutungsversuch *E. T. A. Hoffmann. Ein Kampf um das Bild des Menschen* den Weg zur Förderung des Hoffmanns studiums.

Beruhet Schaukels Darstellung auf der unschwer ersichtlichen Verflochtenheit von Lebenserfahrung und Kunstübung bei Hoffman, die sich thematisch, technisch und ideologisch auf Schritt und Tritt erweist, so behandelt Hewett-Thayer Leben und Werk getrennt und läßt den Leser zur Erkenntnis der organischen

Einheit nur auf Seitenwegen zurückfinden. Entwickelt Schenck Hoffmanns geistige Gestalt genetisch und, wenn auch nicht ohne Schwerpunktverschiebungen, so doch als Ganzes, so trägt Hewett-Thayer von außen Fragestellungen heran und behandelt diese monographisch. Seiner eingehenden und bis in Einzelheiten dem derzeitigen Stand der Forschung gerecht werdenden Lebensbeschreibung, die das erste Drittel des Buches einnimmt, läßt er ein Kapitel folgen, das *Three Fundamentals: Philosophy, Religion and Politics* betitelt ist und gewissenhaft alles Diesbezügliche verzeichnet, aber nicht darüber hinwegtäuschen kann, daß diese Grundlagen allenfalls Arbeitshypothesen sind, die sich im spezifischen Falle Hoffmann als nicht recht fruchtbar erweisen. Das nächste, der Entwicklung von Hoffmanns Stil gewidmete Kapitel geht wiederum nicht von einer zentralen Idee aus und zielt auch auf keine solche ab, sondern verläuft in Form von quell- und stoffgeschichtlichen Aufweisungen und literaturhistorischen Einordnungen. Da beim Leser keinerlei Vertrautheit mit Hoffmanns Werk vorausgesetzt wird, fallen jeweilig erster Blick und post mortem zusammen, was selbstverständlich jedes Erlebnisvermögen übersteigt. Einer streng positivistischen Auffassung von Sachtreue entsprechend werden Hoffmanns Auffassung des Okkulten und seine Deutung des Künstlerproblems in den nächsten beiden Kapiteln induktiv an Hand von chronologisch geordneten Belegstellen aufgezeigt, womit dem Leser die Möglichkeit genommen wird, aus der tieferen Einsicht des Fachmanns Gewinn zu ziehen, da dieser sich mit der Rolle eines anspruchslosen Führers durch das Material bescheidet.

Das Ergebnis des bedeuteten Verfahrens ist ein sachlicher und zuverlässiger Leitfaden, womit Hewett-Thayer vor der Alternative steht, entweder einen Ausstellungsführer zu einer unsichtbaren Sammlung zu liefern, oder durch Bildbeigaben einen gewissen Ersatz für die Originale zu bieten. Er entscheidet sich für die letztere Möglichkeit und unternimmt die Darstellung von Hoffmanns dichterischen Werk in Form von Inhaltsangaben. Die prinzipiellen Einwände gegen diesen Ausweg liegen auf der Hand. Im spezifischen Falle Hoffmann ist er noch unratsamer als gewöhnlich, weil in dessen Bestem und letztlich einzig Wesentlichem die Fabel nur Vordergrund und Durchgangsstadium ist. Das Seelengemälde Kreiser und der Mythos des goldenen Topfes lassen sich nicht episodisch resümiert vermitteln, und das sorgfältige Repertorium von Hoffmanns Einfällen ist kein Ersatz für ein Bild seiner Idee. Diese spürbar zu machen, wie sie aus irdischer Not und Erlösungssehnsucht geboren wird und sich in einem Werk von erregender und beglückender Einmaligkeit als metaphysischer Humor bekennt und verwirklicht, ist dem Autor nicht gelungen. Sein letztes Kapitel, das Hoffman als Literaturkritiker zum Vorwurf hat, ist repräsentativ für ein Buch, dessen sachliche Reichhaltigkeit und Zuverlässigkeit für ein Handbuch vorbildlich sind, das aber in der Auffassung seiner Aufgabe und in der Wahl der Darstellungsmittel nicht völlig zu befriedigen vermag.

FRANZ RENÉ SOMMERFELD

University of Washington

*The French Academies of the Sixteenth Century.* By FRANCES A. YATES.  
London: The Warburg Institute, 1947. Pp. xii + 376. \$10.00.

To most readers the title of Professor Yates's book comes as a surprise, for the Academy sponsored by Richelieu in the seventeenth century is ordinarily regarded as the first in France. To anyone who has ever wondered why there were no French counterparts of the important Italian academies of the Renaissance the standard books on French literature offer little answer. The subject of this book therefore raises hopes of substantial discoveries in a neglected field, the more so when one considers the fine illustrations and the handsome price of this publication.

It turns out, upon examination, that he who has never been aware of French academies in the sixteenth century is not so ignorant after all. The author has had to strain more than one point and indulge in more than one irrelevant discussion to fill out a book of over 300 pages. It must be said to her credit that the treatment of the subject itself is thorough, and if any material is overlooked, this reviewer does not know it. The difficulty lies in the poverty of the subject, which the author seems reluctant to recognize, and in a failure to take account of several facts relevant to sixteenth-century academism.

Two weaknesses are especially difficult to explain. First, Yates gives no attention to the role of salons in stimulating academism. Above all, she misunderstands the development of Platonism in France. It is difficult to see why the influence of Ficino and the Florentine Platonic Academy had to be transmitted to France via Baif's father, who was Francis I's ambassador in Venice, where Ficino had followers. That this was one of many ways by which Platonism penetrated France is not to be disputed. But many facts long ago established by important scholars of the older generation, and more recently by Professor E. F. Meylan, show that the question is not so simple. Why Yates failed to take account of Marguerite de Navarre and the Lyonnais school, as well as persistent native Platonic trends, is hard to perceive, especially so since the author appears to be bibliographically very strong (though the book unfortunately has no bibliography as such!). If the reader of Yates takes pains to consult L. C. Keating's *Studies on the Literary Salon in France, 1550-1615* (Cambridge, Mass., 1941), he will not be misled—in these two respects at least.

Notwithstanding these shortcomings, this study by Yates will henceforth be essential reading for those interested in the early background of the French Academy. It also offers, to those interested more generally in the sixteenth century, a great amount of first-rate discussion of important aspects of the times, for the author writes from a rich appreciation of French society in the Renaissance. The book makes many positive contributions. It corrects some common illusions and offers many pregnant insights into Renaissance ways of thinking, all on good documentary grounds. The role of Dorat and of the Pléiade in the French academic movement, the Renaissance view of the union of poetry and music and their relation to the "encyclopedia," and the connections of sixteenth and seventeenth-century academies are handled with clarity and often with originality—in documentation as well as in interpretation. Among other chapters, the discussion of the relationship of the Baif academy with the Palace Academy of Henri III must be characterized as brilliant. This question, which has always confused or baffled scholars, is now probably closed, thanks to Yates's scholarship and perspicuity.

Some of the merits of the book, however, are emasculated by having only feeble ties with the main subject. The excellent chapters on religious policy and on court entertainments, offering a wealth of interesting information to the general reader, are really not much taken up with academies. The fact that men active in the academies participated in other affairs is not sufficient excuse for discussing those affairs. The academicians, in these instances, usually acted as citizens or writers, and it is impossible to identify their conduct with academism.

In comparing the Italian and French academic movements, it would be interesting to ask what differences in the history of the two countries brought about the vast discrepancy in the importance of academies. It is clear that in one case they answered a real need of society, and in the other no such need was felt. This general question—now that the details of the French academic movement are established—needs to be answered, for Yates has not touched upon it.

When the author leaves the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, she is often in error. This reviewer finds the attempt to show continuity between the sixteenth-century academies and the modern *Institut* without worth. He also finds the statement that "it was the absolutist version of academism . . . which the Revolution threw off, not the academies themselves" to be quite hollow and, if not totally susceptible of proof, at least not proved by Yates. The style of the book is uneven, on occasion animated but often dull. There are too many summaries of speeches and books and too many catalogues.

These weaknesses do not alter the fact that we now have a sound treatment of academies in sixteenth-century France. If the new material brought out by Yates is used in conjunction with other studies, it will do much to round out the available information on an interesting, though not very important, subject.

A. C. KELLER

University of Washington

*André Gide et La Pensée Allemande.* By RENÉE LANG. Paris: Egloff, 1949. Pp. 217.

Few contemporaries are better qualified to write about Gide than Professor Renée Lang, who has devoted many years of her life to this author *bon européen par excellence*.

The significance of the book is deeper than its title denotes. It is much more than the study of an isolated aspect of Gide's intellectual evolution. It is a brilliant and subtle exposé of the interchange that took place between Germany and France in matters of the spirit during the past sixty years. Two great European cultures were in need of each other, and were complementary to each other. Their essential incompatibility, however, according to Professor Lang, finally reveals itself.

Why was it that Gide, obviously well equipped for it, never completed the translations from the German he had planned? Have we to find the reason for this failure in the technical difficulties of translation, stressed by Gide more than once when he complained of the intricacies of German syntax, *profondément déroutante pour l'esprit français*?

In Professor Lang's interpretation, we have to look deeper for the reason. Between what she calls the "German spirit as reflected in the language" and Gide's Latin genius, she detects a barrier that even strenuous efforts did not

enable him to surmount. We have here an *incompatibilité de tempérament, de sensibilité et d'expression*.

Professor Lang's choice of a topic proved especially felicitous through her perfect familiarity with the thought of both France and Germany. Thoroughly at home in the literature of both countries, she has retraced, step by step, the impact of German thought on French intellectuality, as it is reflected in Gide's own evolution. A youthful Gide listened like his symbolistic confrères to watch-words indistinctly pronounced by Germany.

In 1894 Gide began a translation of Novalis' *Heinrich von Ofterdingen*. He was then close to Maeterlinck. While the latter retained his allegiance to mysticism all his life, Gide allowed only so much of it to win a hold over him as corresponded to his inner needs, and turned to other sources of inspiration somewhat later.

Two German influences have been paramount in his intellectual development: that of Nietzsche and that of Goethe. In an evolution the curve of which Renée Lang has very carefully measured, he passed from Nietzschean, Dionysian ecstasy to the Apollonian serenity of Goethe.

It is an interesting aspect of Renée Lang's study that she differs in her estimate of these influences from Gide's own. She states that Gide tends to underrate the part played by Nietzsche in his life, while he stresses that of Goethe. To the present day, when all other German influence has faded from his consciousness, that of Goethe holds its own, and was never disavowed. None other, except maybe Bach, has been, as he says, "as prolonged, as fertile, and as decisive."

Though Goethe's was the chosen influence, the recognized and accepted pattern towards which Gide wanted his life to tend, the conclusions reached by Professor Lang in her study are somewhat different from Gide's self-interpretation. In his constant refusal to be committed to anything, in the deep and fertile restlessness that is characteristic of him, there is more of Nietzsche than of Goethe. His basic attitude is a perpetual readiness to fly to many lands, drink at many sources. This openness to all is very aptly designated by Renée Lang as *une disponibilité passionnée*.

More than any other French writer, Gide's intellectual history is that of the influences to which he chose to expose himself. If we except the French classics—so obviously part and parcel of his culture that they do not count—these influences were all foreign. With the *goût de l'effort* which a Puritan education had fostered in him so well that language difficulties never seriously repelled him, there grew in him a desire for foreign contacts. "L'étrange me sollicite."

Gide's detachment from native soil and culture is only apparent. It is, in Renée Lang's view, in no way blindly submissive to foreign thought. It is just another form of self-exploration: "J'imaginai malgré moi d'autres cultures, d'autres terres, et des routes pour y courir, des routes non tracées; j'imaginai en moi l'être neuf que je sentais s'y élancer. Je m'évadaï." If Gide has allowed foreign modes and trends of thought to penetrate his own, it is not to accept them humbly. It is *pour distiller à travers elles sa propre différence*.

Some of the theses expounded, such as the dating of the Nietzschean influence, took Gide by surprise. It had to be placed earlier than Gide himself recollected. He recognized that her findings were correct.

In the appendix to the book, we find a number of hitherto unpublished letters of Gide, some of them concerned with various questions raised by Renée Lang



in her study. They are of special interest because they bring out clearly the manifold and strong impact of German thought on Gide. They also testify to a love of truth that is really magnificent. "Il ressort de vos rapprochements," he writes to her, "que certaines de mes affirmations au sujet de ma première rencontre avec Nietzsche étaient inexactes. Vous le démontrez avec un grand tact et la plus discrète et charmante courtoisie."

No small part of the charm of Professor Lang's book lies in the fact that it is written in a living and lucid French prose so akin to Gide's own that he paid the author a rare compliment: "Votre pensée se développe, comme aussitôt et sans effort, avec une clarté parfaite et un singulier bonheur d'expression."

Apart from these qualities of style, of its depth and acuity, the merits of Renée Lang's study consist in her capacity to follow subtly and faithfully the rhythm of Gide's intellectual growth, rendering with discernment his many variations, and mirroring judiciously his often changing attitude towards German thought. She has captured in her study much of Gide's rich, protean nature, and has offered a fine scholarly contribution to the history and interpretation of contemporary thought. The book marks a substantial progress in the field of comparative studies.

GEORGETTE R. SCHULER

State College of Washington

*A Critical Anthology of Spanish Verse.* Compiled and edited by E. ALLISON PEERS. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1949. Pp. 1 + 741. \$5.00.

In view of the many anthologies of Spanish poetry already in the field, ranging in size from one volume to fourteen, one wonders at the temerity of editor and publisher in bringing out a new one; that their action was justifiable becomes apparent as we examine the book.

Comparing it with two well-known anthologies that invite comparison, *A Spanish Anthology* by J. D. M. Ford (1901) and *The Oxford Book of Spanish Verse* by James Fitzmaurice-Kelly (1913), we find that the Peers compilation has twice as many pages of poetry as that of Ford and fifty per cent more than Fitzmaurice-Kelly's; that the number of selections is, respectively, 368, 210, and 222; that the number of poets represented, not counting anonymous authors, is 118, 107, and 98; and that there is no remarkable variation in the choice of poets in so far as common ground is covered by the three anthologies. There is, however, a notable difference in the time range and in the number of poetic genres represented. The Ford collection contains only lyrics or poems in which the lyrical element is dominant; the first selection, the *Aventura amorosa*, belongs to the thirteenth century; and the twentieth century is, of course, not represented at all. The *Oxford Book*, although primarily a collection of Spanish lyrics, does give considerable space to poems that are usually classified as narrative, elegiac, and satirical; it, too, begins with the oldest lyrical poem extant, the *Rasón de amor* (*Aventura amorosa*). The Peers compilation is more comprehensive. Since the editor's purpose was to give representation to all poetic genres except the dramatic, there are substantial extracts from the old epics and from narrative poems of a later date, with sufficient explanation of the context to make the fragments intelligible. Beginning with the twelfth century (*Poema de Mio Cid*),

and containing poems by twenty-six authors belonging, for the most part, to the twentieth century, his anthology covers at least a hundred more years than the other two. All three exclude the rich literature of Spanish America, with the exception of five or six poets who have gained a reputation that is more than national.

As to introductions, all three offer historical and critical surveys. The best, because of its artistic unity, its high standard of literary criticism, and the exquisite diction that characterizes all of Fitzmaurice-Kelly's writings, is the *Oxford Book*. The shortest, most matter-of-fact, is the one by Professor Ford; but it should be noted that, in compensation for its brevity, it is followed by one of the best treatises in English on Spanish prosody. The most useful of the three surveys for the student who is just beginning the serious study of Spanish poetry is that of Professor Peers; not only does it give a good account of the historical development of Spanish poetry; by suggestive comments upon the peculiar qualities of the literature of Spain (regionalism, individualism versus standardization, the blending of realism and idealism, dynamic energy and universality) he prepares the student for a better understanding and appreciation.

If, then, this new anthology can well stand comparison with the best already published, certain innovations give it added justification. The introductory commentary on each poet excludes the usual biographical details that may be found in a history of Spanish literature and concentrates upon the literary significance of the writer. Each poem or group of poems is preceded by an explanatory comment that offers the immature student essential clues to its understanding and appreciation. "What has all the time been kept in view is the most effective method of stimulating the reader to criticism and appreciation" (Preface, p. v).

All three anthologies have their points of excellence. Because of the attractive format that it has in common with all the famous *Oxford Books* and because of the sure literary taste of its editor, the Fitzmaurice-Kelly anthology will remain the favorite manual of those who have had a long acquaintance with Spanish poetry. The one by Ford will retain its wide popularity with Spanish teachers who have used its excellent presentation of Spanish prosody, its copious notes, and glossary. The most recent will gradually make its way into general use as the most adequate textbook for a specialized course on the poetry of Spain.

GEORGE W. UMPHREY

University of Washington

*The Canterbury Tales of Geoffrey Chaucer: A New Modern English Prose Translation, Together with the Original Middle English Text of the General Prologue and the Nun's Priest's Tale.* By R. M. LUMIANSKY. With a Preface by MARK VAN DOREN, and Illustrations by H. LAWRENCE HOFFMAN. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1948. Pp. xxix + 345. \$2.95.

The recent appearance, in Professor R. M. Lumiansky's idiomatic translation, of early England's greatest poet, Geoffrey Chaucer, should inspire a large part of the literate American public to read, perhaps for the first time, the undeniably engrossing stories which compose the richest of all medieval collections—the imperishable *Canterbury Tales*. This new work is furbished to capture readers. It has a short preface by the well-known critic Mark Van Doren, and a display of startling colored drawings by the modernistic illustrator H. Lawrence Hoff-

man. Eulogies of Chaucer from fifteen authors lead the novice to Lumiansky's excellent introductory observations. A thoughtful appendix contains, for the curious, the "General Prologue" and "Nun's Priest's Tale" in Chaucer's Middle English.

Young teachers may believe that colleges are fit places to use profitably this most modern version, although only yesterday high school students, with occasional inaccuracy, quoted the poet's own tongue. Though admittedly a traditionalist, I can recall in twenty years of teaching most success when Chaucer was read in the original. If a translation in present-day English is demanded, Lumiansky's work may be recommended as reasonably clear and accurate: "Wel nyne and twenty in a compaignye" becomes (fittingly) "a group of twenty-nine people"; "A Knyght ther was, and that a worthy man / That fro the tyme that he first bigan / To riden out, he loved chivalrie" becomes (less satisfactorily in its changed tense) "There was among us a brave knight who had loved chivalry . . . from the time of his first horseback rides"; and "A Monk ther was, a fair for the maistrie," becomes (misleadingly, I think) "There was a Monk, an outstanding one." Lumiansky throughout affords an impression of the original, not its meaning to the letter. Though the spirit of Chaucer's personality is lost, Lumiansky's readable book demonstrates that *The Canterbury Tales* is eminently worthy of perusal for its plot, action, and characterizations. Chaucer's prominence as a spinner of first-rate yarns is thus brought home anew. For this reason, I believe that Lumiansky has accomplished something worthwhile. The reader who wishes to turn to corking good stories in a language readily understandable will find Lumiansky's book the best on the market.

The revised *Modern Reader's Chaucer* (1936), a noteworthy labor by the late Professor Tatlock and the poet Percy MacKaye, fully translates Chaucer's complete poetical works; whereas Lumiansky treats only *The Canterbury Tales* and these incompletely. The Melibeus and the recitals of the Monk, the Parson, and the Prioress are the four summarized. The first three he discounts as "moralizing"; the last, "for another reason." Censorship of the Prioress is surprising. For six centuries readers hitherto have not been alarmed by Chaucer's strictures on the fanaticism of the Jews who murdered the little choirboy. Yet Lumiansky now would introduce a *cause célèbre*, declaring that "For most of us, 'The Prioress' Tale' is ruined by the similarity between this sort of story and some of the anti-Semitic propaganda which was current in Nazi Germany, and which is still in operation, not only in numerous foreign countries but also here at home."

Is this not an inadvertence to link Chaucer with Nazi Germany? The average American "here at home" is reasonably broadminded, so why deny him the full text? Nothing can alter today the intention of the Prioress' criticism; but the whole truth includes the fact that Chaucer reported what history taught him, namely that these particular Jews murdered Hugh of Lincoln, a lad of twelve, in the year 1255. It is elementary; but let us, like the Dark Ages, be sufficiently liberal to examine *The Canterbury Tales* as it was written, with smut about the Miller, disapproval of the cruelty of Griselda's Italian husband, as well as pity for the little choirboy. The people in Chaucer's timeless world, as large as life itself, are not a race—English, Italian, or Jewish—but the human race of a magnificent comedy.

HALDEEN BRADDY

Texas College of Mines, El Paso

*John Milton at St. Paul's School: A Study of Ancient Rhetoric in English Renaissance Education.* By DONALD LEMEN CLARK. New York: Columbia University Press, 1948. Pp. x + 269. \$3.50.

St. Paul's School has the great distinction of having been instituted by John Colet according to the theories of education derived by its founder from his friend Erasmus and of having educated John Milton according to Colet's original plan, essentially unchanged. It was a program of teaching based upon the procedures and purposes of the ancient Roman schools which had educated Cicero and Ovid, and it was still designed to train a picked class of youths in grammar, logic, and rhetoric, which is to say, in the learned languages and in the arts of discourse, as conceived, however, according to the humanistic rather than the scholastic tradition.

Professor Clark, who as one would expect is not prone to romantic or sentimental inferences or embroideries upon fact, clarifies certain biographical points relating to Milton's youth. The school played the major role in the education both of the future poet and the Puritan pamphleteer. Thomas Young's part was to carry his pupil forward in the normal school program when, for one reason or another, the boy was kept at home. The reports of Milton's early suffering from weakness of the eyes and the legend of his precocious and prodigious devotion to study in childhood need not be taken quite at face value. The high master, Alexander Gil, Sr., and his son, who was Milton's friend, were more interesting figures and exercised a more important influence than we have been led to suppose. Professor Clark throws fresh light on the older man's *Logonomia Anglica* and his interest in English poetry and on the various troubles the younger got himself into through his too indiscreet enthusiasm for reform of one sort or another.

But the most important contribution of this well-ordered and informing book is its full, exact, and detailed account of the manner in which the ancient art of keeping school was conducted at St. Paul's in the years when Milton plied his daily task in full view of Colet's "durable bust" and the motto *aut doce, aut discere, aut discere*. We have here the curriculum, the textbooks, the authors for reading and imitation, the exercises for practice, which were designed to turn the sons of London citizens into the citizens of a Roman commonwealth. Though Milton did not go to his university with an Exhibition from his school, he went fully possessed of the spirit and method of its teaching. The Erasmian discipline is clearly the basis of his own idealized scheme in *Of Education*, and the harsh things he had to say about contemporary modes of teaching are directed, not at St. Paul's, but at Cambridge and Oxford. How thoroughly he had mastered the things taught at Colet's school, his career is the best evidence. Professor Clark does not encourage us to make over much of the notion that Milton had a soul that preferred to live apart from great concerns of his age. He was at all times consistently faithful to the ideals of the classical rhetoric in which he was reared. This was that "inclusive rhetoric," as Professor Clark says, "maintained by Isocrates, Cicero, and Quintilian," the aim of which was to train the whole man for public affairs, to produce orator statesmen who should know how to guide the commonwealth not by force but by reasoned and impassioned eloquence. But, as Professor Clark has himself previously shown us, the line between eloquence and poetry, for Milton and his generation, was one extremely difficult if not impossible to draw.

WILLIAM HALLER

Columbia University

*Index to Defoe's Review*. By WILLIAM L. PAYNE. New York: Columbia University Press, 1948. Pp. x + 144. \$4.00.

That lazy kind of learning, as Fuller suggests, which is only indical, is practiced by (piecemeal) scholars who nibble but at the tables, neglecting the body of the Book. But though the idle deserve no crutches, pity it is the weary (and harried) should be denied the benefit thereof.

With such in mind Dr. Payne has compiled a staggering cross index of 30,000 items to Defoe's *Review*. His purpose is to include only significant entries. The book is not meant to be a concordance, nor a "*vade mecum* which unlocks mysteries that Defoe scholars hesitate to expound." Not included are the innumerable initialed characters who in the heat of controversy were dashed upon the page. The author has comforted himself with Dr. Johnson's admonition: "Lay the foundation, and leave the superstructure to posterity."

Accuracy and inclusiveness are the touchstones of appraisal in such an index. In both Dr. Payne has splendidly stood the test. Following a procedure recently and hastily discredited in a different arena of endeavor (but there the aim is not fact or truth, but an axe to grind and a tabulation of particular noses), this reviewer had the temerity to pick at random five hundred samplings from the *Index*. In only seven were errors found, three of which would be immediately discernible to students of the *Review*. To quote Defoe: "The Reader is Desir'd to Correct the following Errors of the Press" in the *Index to Defoe's Review*:

p. 4: *African Company, never destined to succeed*, III, 624b. There is no mention of the African Company on this page. Should the notation be V, 623b-624a?

p. 9: *Bank, invasion threat grave shock to*, V, 55a, should be V, 555a.

p. 28: *Dueling, Scandalous Club on*, I, 259b, should be I, 359a-b.

p. 32: *Enclosures, poor consent to*, VI, 71b, should be VI, 171a-b.

p. 37: *Families, 1000 as creditors of African Co.* Volume VII should be printed before 155b.

p. 92: *Power exorbitant, British must fight*, VI, 803b, should be VIII, 803b; *must everywhere be crushed*, 818a, will also be found in Volume VIII.

p. 129: *Universities, none study engineering in*, IV, 373b, should be V, 373b.

p. 131: The letter u is omitted from *Vaudemont* under *Victory*, V, 159a.

Dr. Payne has thus provided our compass box of the *Review* with a true needle, subject only to human fallibility. All admirers of the *Review* shall hereafter list him among those scholars who, as Bolingbroke says, "enable others to study with greater ease and to purposes more useful."

OSCAR SHERWIN

City College of New York

*William Blake: His Philosophy and Symbols*. By S. FOSTER DAMON. New York: Peter Smith, 1947. Pp. xiv + 487. \$12.50.

During the last twenty-five years the reputation of Foster Damon's *William Blake: His Philosophy and Symbols* has grown steadily until it is now considered with Lowes's *Road to Xanadu* as one of the great works of modern academic scholarship. As the first book to present an intelligible key to Blake's symbols, it has been greatly responsible for the astonishing development of Blake criticism; it has made possible, for example, such impressive studies as those of

Frye and Schorer. And undoubtedly it has provided the basis for an intelligent teaching of Blake in our universities. The present reissue of the volume, the first since its publication in 1924, is a belated recognition of its importance.

Unfortunately because the book has been reissued at such an outrageous price and without necessary revision, it will neither reach the wide audience it deserves, nor possess the practical value it once had. The appendix, occupying half the book and providing an almost line by line commentary on the poems, is potentially one of the most useful aids available to the student of Blake. But its references are to editions of the poems which are incomplete, like Samson's, or notoriously inaccurate, like Ellis'. No use has been made of Geoffrey Keynes's edition of the complete works, appearing in 1925, which has been accepted as the definitive edition and upon which have been based all recent interpretations. Frequently, as in portions of the *Four Zoas* and *Milton* (one plate of which Damon does not have), page and line arrangements are different, and important textual emendations have been made by Keynes. Furthermore, as the result of recent studies, many of Damon's notes need to be revised or expanded and others added. What is so irritating is not merely that much of the appendix cannot be used easily or effectively as it stands, but that the publishers have missed a wonderful opportunity to supply the greatest need of the Blake student—an up-to-date annotation of the poems, especially the prophetic books, based upon the Keynes edition. If Damon could not do the work himself, why then did not the publishers get some other scholar to edit the notes? I fear that the answer lies in a desire to exploit quickly and profitably Damon's prestige and the present interest in Blake.

However, it is the first half of the book—the critical study of Blake and his work—which is most important, and the reissue offers an excellent opportunity to reevaluate it against the background of the studies which have followed upon the initial publication. The extent of Damon's achievement was perhaps best stated by R. P. Blackmur in "A Critic's Job of Work" (*Double Agent*, pp. 297-98): "Mr. Damon made Blake exactly what he seemed least to be, perhaps the most intellectually consistent of the greater poets in English. Since the chief weapons used are the extended facts of scholarship, the picture Mr. Damon produced cannot be destroyed even though later and other scholarship modifies, rearranges, or adds to it with different or other facts." And this statement has been borne out; later studies have incorporated and expanded but have not seriously altered Damon's interpretations, except in one or two respects. In the opening chapter, for example, there is an arbitrary effort to squeeze the visionary nonconformist Blake into the rigid pattern of the fivefold Mystic Way. Fortunately the interpretations of the poems do not depend upon this initial hypothesis; in fact, Damon's lucid demonstration that the poems can all be made intelligible and "intellectually consistent" contradicts it. But it sets Blake within a false perspective and misleads the uncritical student into talking nonsense instead of trying to understand him. Consequently the recent efforts of critics like Schorer and Frye to correct the perspective by throwing out the word "mystic" have been all to the good. Damon also somewhat hastily dismisses Blake's interest in politics and social reform following his supposed disillusionment with the French Revolution, and he overlooks the significance of revolutionary social philosophy in the development of the mythology of the later prophetic books. Here, again, Schorer corrects the perspective in his *William Blake: The Politics of Vision*.

But such corrections are relatively minor and little more than the exceptions that prove the truth of Blackmur's statement. In general, Damon's book remains



perhaps the best introduction to Blake ever written. Compact and clear, it presents not only the basic information on Blake's life and background but also an invaluable elucidation of the poetry. And at this moment of controversy over the merits of extrinsic and intrinsic criticism, we are fortunate in having a book reissued that illustrates so excellently the interdependence of scholarship and criticism, of research and close reading. If the objection is raised that Blake's poetry involves special problems, then the reply may be made that most poetry, particularly contemporary, involves special problems and that Damon's method may be applied with equal felicity to all of them. His book should be read, therefore, not only by those interested in Blake, but by all interested in critical method; and this is further reason for wishing that it had been reissued at a reasonable price.

EDWARD E. BOSTETTER

University of Washington

*A Bibliography of William Dean Howells.* By WILLIAM M. GIBSON and GEORGE ARMS. New York: The New York Public Library, 1948. Pp. 1-182. \$2.25.

If we regard William Dean Howells as merely an author of books and think of the two hundred or more formidable volumes which lie between the student and his understanding of this writer, we do imperfect justice to his true position in the world of letters. Howells was first and always a journalist, a contributor for no fewer than sixty-nine consecutive years to the newspapers and magazines of this country. Even the large number of bound tomes which stand under his name on the library shelves were for the most part first composed for periodicals and only later collected into books.

In *A Bibliography of William Dean Howells* Messrs. Gibson and Arms have listed every item, whether newspaper, magazine, pamphlet, or book (including all reprints and editions) which was published in this country. The monumental task of searching for and putting in order the hundreds of items herein encompassed makes possible for the first time a study of Howells with some hope that what this author wrote and when he wrote it may at least be known. Hitherto, without such an instrument of research, an adequate understanding of Howells has been impossible to attain. Indeed, one may assume that this lack has to some extent been responsible for the curious critical opinions expressed during the past three or four decades concerning Howells and his work. Students have tended too much to think of him as "The Dean" and too little to remember that he was once a voluminous journalist trying to keep abreast of current ideas—and of bills.

According to its Table of Contents the volume before us is divided into six sections. First comes "Check List of Works and Partial Works" (pp. 11-14). Here are, in chronological order, Howells' books and other volumes which contain one or more of his writings. Then we have "Check List of Periodicals, Newspapers, and Departments" (p. 15), to which this amazing writer contributed between 1852 and 1920. There follows "Collations of Works and Partial Works" (pp. 16-74), in which each volume named in the first section is described according to the finest scholarly method. After this we have the "Annual Register: Chronological List of Periodical Publications, Including Volume Titles" (pp.



74-158). From an examination of this Register we come to see the relationship between the hundreds of newspaper and periodical contributions and the volumes into which they were collected for republication. An overlapping is to be noted here, for the book titles which appear in this section were previously listed in the first section of the *Bibliography*, and they were again minutely described in the third section. This repetition, however, far from being a blemish, is a convenience to the student, who would otherwise have to turn back and forth through the several sections to assemble desired data. It merely contributes to the beautiful clarity of the *Bibliography*.

A fifth section, "Selected Critical Writings" (pp. 158-70), supplies the Howells scholar with the best working reference list now available. Though this list is excellent, there still remains the difficulty of locating information on particular aspects of Howells' work. Since this section goes alphabetically by the names of the many critics (including "Anonymous," Boston *Transcript*, and others hard to classify) and since there is no cross index to writings of Howells specifically treated, the researcher must read through the whole list every time he needs certain information which might be made more accessible. For instance, if one wants to read the criticism of *A Hazard of New Fortunes*, one must seek out items under "Anonymous," "Curtis, G. W.," "Drake, F. C.," "Scudder, H. E.," in addition to the general volumes one will require.

The last of the six sections of the book, "Name Index, Including Illustrators" (pp. 171-82) presents a difficulty which is likely to give many people trouble. The system of reference back to the hundreds of items of which the *Bibliography* is composed is so difficult that one cannot remember from one week to the next how to use the *Bibliography*. Surely a more simple method could have been devised. This fault, however, can hardly be called a serious defect in the work of the compiler, though it is an annoyance.

We now have in this admirable bibliography the first essential tool with which to go about studying and evaluating Howells (and through him his age, for he embodies it all). The next requirement is a complete edition of his works so thoroughly prepared that both the literary man and the historian may come to realize how fully this great author in himself comprises his age.

RUDOLF KIRK

Rutgers University

## BOOKS RECEIVED

### AMERICAN

- Thurlow, Constance E., and Francis L. Berkeley, Jr. *The Jefferson Papers of the University of Virginia: A Calendar. With an Appended Essay by Helen D. Bullock on the Papers of Thomas Jefferson.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Library, with Assistance from the Research Council of the Richmond Area University Center, University of Virginia Bibliographical Series, No. 8, 1950. Pp. xii + 343. \$5.00.

### ENGLISH

- Albrecht, William P. *William Hazlitt and the Malthusian Controversy.* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Publications in Language and Literature, No. 4, 1950. Pp. 124. \$1.00.
- Banks, Theodore Howard. *Milton's Imagery.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1950. Pp. xiv + 260. \$3.50.
- Bredvold, Louis I. *The Contributions of John Wilkes to the Gazette Littéraire de l'Europe.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Contributions in Modern Philology, No. 15, February, 1950. Pp. 36. \$0.75.
- Brittain, Robert (editor). *Poems by Christopher Smart.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950. Pp. xii + 326. \$4.00.
- Bush, Douglas. *Science and English Poetry: A Historical Sketch, 1590-1950. The Patten Lectures.* Indiana University, 1949. New York: Oxford University Press, 1950. Pp. viii + 166. \$3.50.
- Coghill, Nevill. *Visions from Piers Plowman, Taken from the Poem of William Langland, and Translated into Modern English.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1950. Pp. 143. \$3.00.
- Cordasco, Francesco. *The 18th Century Novel: A Handlist of General Histories and Articles of the Last Twenty-Five Years with a Notice of Bibliographical Guides. With an Introductory Note by James R. Foster.* Brooklyn: Long Island University 18th Century Bibliographical Pamphlets, No. 8, 1950. Pp. 20.
- Dorian, Donald Clayton. *The English Diodatis.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1950. Pp. xvii + 365. \$5.00.
- Grabo, Carl H. *Shelley's Eccentricities.* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Publications in Language and Literature, No. 5, 1950. Pp. 84. \$1.00.
- Hartley, Lodwick. *William Cowper: A List of Critical and Biographical Studies Published from 1895 to 1949.* Raleigh: North Carolina State College Record, Vol. 49, No. 6, February, 1950. Pp. 24.
- Hine, Reginald L. *Charles Lamb and His Hertfordshire.* New York: Macmillan Company, 1950. Pp. xxv + 374. \$3.75.
- Holaday, Allan. *Thomas Heywood's The Rape of Lucrece.* Urbana: University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, XXXIV, No. 3, 1950. Pp. ix + 185. \$2.00, paper; \$3.00, cloth.
- Holland, Vyvyan (editor). *De Profundis, being the first complete and accurate version of "Epistola: in Carcere et Vinculis," the last prose work in English of Oscar Wilde.* New York: Philosophical Library, 1950. Pp. 148. \$3.00.
- Holzknrecht, Karl J. *The Backgrounds of Shakespeare's Plays.* New York: American Book Company, 1950. Pp. x + 482. \$4.75.

- Kerby-Miller, Charles (editor). *Memoirs of the Extraordinary Life, Works, and Discoveries of Martinus Scriblerus, Written in Collaboration by the Members of the Scriblerus Club: John Arbuthnot, Alexander Pope, Jonathan Swift, John Gay, Thomas Parnell, and Robert, Earl of Oxford.* New Haven: Published for Wellesley College by the Yale University Press, 1950. Pp. ix + 408. \$5.00.
- Kirby, Thomas A., and Henry Bosley Woolf (editors). *Philologica: The Malone Anniversary Studies.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1949. Pp. x + 382. \$7.50.
- Lawrence, William Witherle. *Chaucer and the Canterbury Tales.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1950. Pp. ix + 184. \$2.50.
- Nicoll, Allardyce (editor). *Shakespeare Survey: An Annual Survey of Shakespearean Study & Production.* Vol. 3. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1950. Pp. viii + 167. \$2.75.
- Noyes, George R. (editor). *The Poetical Works of Dryden.* New edition, revised and enlarged. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, Cambridge edition, 1950. Pp. lxxii + 1095. \$5.00.
- Osborne, Mary Tom. *Advice-to-a-Painter Poems, 1633-1856: An Annotated Finding List.* With Introduction by Mary Tom Osborne, and Foreword by Reginald Harvey Griffith. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1949. Pp. 92.
- Schilling, Bernard N. *Conservative England and the Case Against Voltaire.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1950. Pp. xii + 394. \$4.50.
- Smith, David Nichol. *John Dryden. The Clark Lectures in English Literature, 1948-9.* Cambridge: At the University Press, 1950. Pp. 93. \$1.75.
- Tatlock, J. S. P. *The Legendary History of Britain: Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae* and Its Early Vernacular Versions.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1950. Pp. 545. \$7.50.
- Wagner, Bernard M. *The Appreciation of Shakespeare: A Collection of Criticism—Philosophic, Literary, and Esthetic—by Great Writers and Scholars—Critics of the 18th, 19th, and 20th Centuries.* Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1949. Pp. xi + 481 + 40. \$5.00.
- Walker, Imogene B. James Thomson [B. V.]: *A Critical Study.* Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1950. Pp. ix + 212. \$2.50.

## GERMAN

- Graves, Marie Haefliger. *Schiller and Wagner: A Study of Their Dramatic Theory and Technique.* A Dissertation. Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1938. Printed in France by Imprimerie Générale de la Nièvre. Pp. 128.
- Holz, Arno, and Johannes Schlaf. *Die Familie Selicke.* Cambridge: At the University Press, German Plain Texts, 1950. Pp. vi + 80. 2s. 6d. \$0.45.
- Körner, Josef. *Einführung in die Poetik.* Frankfurt am Main: Verlag G. Schulte-Bulmke, 1949. Pp. 60. DM 2.50.
- . *Marginalien: Kritische Beiträge zur geistesgeschichtlichen Forschung. Erste Folge.* Frankfurt am Main: Verlag G. Schulte-Bulmke, 1950. Pp. 91. DM 5.—.
- Lenz, J. M. R. *Die Soldaten.* Cambridge: At the University Press, German Plain Texts, 1950. Pp. viii + 68. 2s. 6d. \$0.45.

## ROMANCE LANGUAGES

- Cook, Alta Lind (translator). *Sonnets of Louise Labé "La Belle Cordière."* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1950. Pp. xiii + [48]. \$2.25.
- Davies, Gardner. *Les "Tombeaux" de Mallarmé: Essai d'Exégèse Raisonnée.* Paris: Librairie José Corti, 1950. Pp. 232.
- Douglas, Kenneth. *A Critical Bibliography of Existentialism (The Paris School).* New Haven: Yale French Studies, Special Monograph No. 1, 1950. No pagination.
- Franklin, Burt, and G. Legman. *David Ricardo and Ricardian Theory: A Bibliographical Checklist.* New York: Burt Franklin Bibliographical Series, No. 1, 1949. Pp. 88. \$6.50.
- Gide, André. *Autumn Leaves.* Translated from the French "Feuillets d'Automne" by Elsie Pell. New York: Philosophical Library, 1950. Pp. 296. \$3.75.
- Gravit, Francis W. *The Peiresc Papers.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Contributions in Modern Philology, No. 14, February, 1950. Pp. 57. \$1.00.
- Ihrig, Grace Pauline. *Heroines in French Drama of the Romantic Period, 1829-1848.* New York: King's Crown Press, Columbia University, 1950. Pp. 246. \$3.00.
- Jourda, Pierre. *Marot: L'Homme et l'Œuvre.* Paris: Boivin & Co, *Le Livre de l'Étudiant*, Collection Fondée par Paul Hasard, 26, 1950. Pp. 168.
- Lapp, John C. (editor). *The Universe of Pontus de Tyard: A Critical Edition of L'Univers.* Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Romance Studies, Vol. 3, 1950. Pp. ix + 201. \$3.00.
- Mauriac, François. *Proust's Way.* Translated from the Original French "Du Côté de Chez Proust" by Elsie Pell. New York: Philosophical Library, 1950. Pp. 105. \$3.00.
- Melcher, Edith. *The Life and Times of Henry Monnier.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950. Pp. ix + 253. \$4.25.
- Moore, W. G. *Molière: A New Criticism.* Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1949. Pp. 136. \$2.50. Distributed in U.S.A. by Oxford University Press.
- Navarro, Mons. Nicolás E. (editor). *Diario de Bucaramanga por L. Peru de Lacroix.* Caracas: Ediciones del Ministerio de Educación Nacional, Dirección de Cultura, Biblioteca Venezolana de Cultura Colección "Andrés Bello," 1949. Pp. 281.
- Renan, Ernest. *La Réforme Intellectuelle et Morale.* Edited with an Introduction by P. E. Charvet. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1950. Pp. xxvii + 204. \$2.00.
- Roddiér, Henri. *J.-J. Rousseau en Angleterre au XVIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle: L'Œuvre et l'Homme.* Paris: Boivin & Co, *Études de Littérature Étrangère et Comparée*, n.d. Pp. 435. 800 fr.
- Starr, William Thomas. *A Critical Bibliography of the Published Writings of Romain Rolland.* Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Studies, Humanities Series, No. 21, 1950. Pp. xxiii + 138. \$3.50.
- Tully, Marjorie F., and Juan B. Rael. *An Annotated Bibliography of Spanish Folklore in New Mexico and Southern Colorado.* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Publications in Language and Literature, No. 3, 1950. Pp. 124. \$1.00.

Vicente, Alonzo Zamora (editor). *Tirso de Molina: Por El Sotano y El Torno*. Edicion prologo y notas de Alonzo Zamora Vicente. Buenos Aires: Facultad de Filosofia y Letras de la Universidad de Buenos Aires, Instituto de Filologia, Seccion Romanica, 1949. Pp. 217.

Weinberg, Bernard. *Critical Prefaces of the French Renaissance*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1950. Pp. 290. \$5.00.

## SLAVIC

Bodde, Derk. Tolstoy. With the Collaboration of Galia Speshneff Bodde. Princeton: Princeton University History of Ideas Series, No. 4, 1950. Pp. vi + 110. \$2.50.

Cornyn, William S. *Beginning Russian*. New Haven: Yale University Linguistic Series, 1950. Pp. xii + 310. \$5.00.

Lavaska, Anna. *Russian in Song (with Music)*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1949. Pp. 78. \$2.50.

Smal-Stocky, Roman. *The Origin of the Word "Rus."* Winnipeg, Manitoba: Canadian-Ukrainian Institute "Prosvita," *Slavistica*, No. 6. Pp. 24.

## GENERAL

Adam, G. F. *Three Contemporary Anglo-Welsh Novelists: Jack Jones, Rhys Davies, and Hilda Vaughan*. Bern: A. Francke Ag. Verlag, 1949. Pp. 109. 12 s.fr.

DeJongh, William F. J. *Western Language Manuals of the Renaissance*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Publications in Language and Literature, No. 1, 1949. Pp. 46. \$0.50.

Lee, Hector. *The Three Nephites: The Substance and Significance of the Legend in Folklore*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Publications in Language and Literature, No. 2, 1949. Pp. 162. \$1.50.

Partridge, Eric. *A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English: Colloquialisms and Catch-Phrases, Solecisms and Catachreses, Vulgarisms and such Americanisms as have been naturalized*. Third edition, revised and much enlarged. New York: Macmillan Company, 1950. Pp. xvi + 1230. \$11.50.

Rooney, William Joseph. *The Problem of "Poetry and Belief" in Contemporary Criticism*. A Dissertation. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1949. Pp. vii + 165. \$1.75.

Teggart, Frederick J. *The Idea of Progress: A Collection of Readings*. Revised edition, with an Introduction by George H. Hildebrand. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1949. Pp. xi + 457. \$6.00.











